

Interactive comment on “An Investigation into the Relationship between Teleconnections and Taiwan’s Streamflow” by Chia-Jeng Chen and Tsung-Yu Lee

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 20 March 2017

Having previously reviewed an earlier draft of this manuscript, it was a pleasure to be able to review it again with the previous reviewer’s comments addressed. While the revised article is not much different to the previous version, it is no longer part of a special issue on seasonal forecasting, and I feel it fits better as an individual contribution to HESS.

In general, this paper offers something novel and interesting to the scientific community, however I do - as before - still have some issues with the way the paper has been written. The language and writing style has not really been addressed since the previous version, and I think it would benefit from being much tighter and succinct in part.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



For example, the beginning of the discussion is overly wordy and a bit conversational. I would suggest it be altered from:

"In this section, further discussion is provided to address the issue of CRS and how it can impact the convention of seasonal forecasting evidenced by some large-scale patterns. To start the discussion, we would like to argue that the two change points found for the response of Taiwan's streamflow to large-scale circulations are not a coincidence."

to something like this:

"In this study, we find that the two change points for the response of Taiwan's streamflow to large-scale circulations are not a coincidence."

As the discussion moves forward, you could then bring in the issue of CRS and how it can impact seasonal forecasting evidenced by some large-scale patterns. This is just one example, and there are many parts of the manuscript that I believe could be improved along these lines.

On the topic of seasonal forecasting itself, this is first introduced at the very end of the introduction (as the authors note the following structure of the paper), but there is no explanation for its inclusion. It is discussed in section 4, but why not before then if this is truly a motivation of the paper? I feel that this is a bit of a hangover from the previous version that was then part of a special issue on seasonal forecasting, but it now feels out of place and perhaps a little bit forced.

In conclusion, I believe this paper to be worthy of publication, but would just like to see it tightened a little before it is published.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2017-69, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

