

## ***Interactive comment on* “Technical Note: Combining Quantile Forecasts and Predictive Distributions of Stream-flows” by Konrad Bogner et al.**

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 30 June 2017

The study provides a comparison of different methods for combining probabilistic forecasts of streamflows. It finds that the methods included in the study performed more or less the same, all led to improvement over the raw ensembles. The study is of interests to the ensemble hydrological forecasting community and has good material to present.

I believe the writing of the paper needs to be substantially improved before it is suitable for publications. I found it frustrating to read, as information is not always complete or logically organised. For example, “ I cannot make sense of the section before 2.1 under Methods; “ The first paragraph under Results is a way too long to read; “ Following Figure 2 on CRPS for raw forecasts and comparison with BLP forecasts, it

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



would be logical to show Figure 4 for comparison of CRPS from different aggregation methods, rather than going to PIT histogram (Figure 3) first; In Figure 4, it will be good to denote COSMO-LEPS raw forecasts (as in other figures), rather than just raw forecasts; In the first paragraph under Results, it states: "Since the 16 ensemble members are exchangeable, the numbering of the ensemble members is independent between consecutive forecast days". This seems to me a bit strange.

The above list is by no means exhaustive. There is room to sharpen up the writing throughout the paper.

With effort from the authors to improve the writing, the paper will be a good one to publish.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-291>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

