

## ***Interactive comment on “Comment: Getting the Methodology Wrong for Analysing the Hydrological Changes in Watersheds” by Nitin Bassi et al.***

**R.A. Woods**

ross.woods@bristol.ac.uk

Received and published: 16 May 2018

The HESS policy for writing critical manuscripts says "8. A criticism of a published paper may sometimes be justified; however, in no case is personal criticism considered to be appropriate." ([https://www.hydrology-and-earth-system-sciences.net/for\\_authors/obligations\\_for\\_authors.html](https://www.hydrology-and-earth-system-sciences.net/for_authors/obligations_for_authors.html))

I do not think that this manuscript meets the standard, because the manuscript repeatedly directs criticism at "the authors". In my opinion, this manuscript would be much more effective if it focused on information.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



I do see that there is potentially an important point to make about how our access to data (and indeed our knowledge that the data is accessible) determines whether a catchment is perceived as ungauged by different researchers. This and other valid points could be made without writing in a critical style, and using a wider selection of examples.

Last week I taught a course on science communication to PhD students in the WISE CDT. We discussed ideas of "Kindness in Science" in the context of paper reviewing. I encourage anyone who is interested to read this commentary: <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-00482-y>

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-187>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

