

Interactive comment on “Modelling Hydrological Ecosystem Services – A state of the art model comparison” by Anna Lüke and Jochen Hack

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 5 October 2017

The authors present three models to assess Hydrological Ecosystem Services. Although the manuscript is well written and organised, I don't see the added value for the hydrological community. In my view, the authors just present the results of 3 models (which are not explained how they work) for a case study and then conclude that the results have different meaning for HES. Next, they come up with some guidelines to help to deal with those difference. This is too minor for a scientific article in HESS in my opinion. So maybe another journal/platform is better.

P1-L21: Please repeat the definition of HES of Brauman et al, since the hydrological community might not be well familiar with this concept.

P1-L21: Maybe explain the difference between HES and ES.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



P2-L9: typo in 'application'

P4-L12-13: remove the line breaks before 'appendix'

P9-L14: typo 'form' => from

Fig 5: how does the postprocessing of SWAT works?

Fig 6: how should I interpret these results? What is meant by 'capacity of ES' and 'beneficiaries'?

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2017-436>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

