

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

**AN Flores**

lejoflores@boisestate.edu

Received and published: 18 May 2018

In the interests of scientific rigor and transparency, the EGU and editors of Hydrology and Earth System Sciences provide two mechanisms for the community to comment on submitted contributions: (1) the interactive discussion period while the paper is in preprint at HESSD, and (2) the peer-reviewed comment and reply. In the case of the later, the purpose is to "[continue] the discussion of a scientific paper beyond the limits of immediate interactive discussion in HESSD" ([https://www.hydrology-and-earth-system-sciences.net/peer\\_review/commenting\\_on\\_a\\_paper.html](https://www.hydrology-and-earth-system-sciences.net/peer_review/commenting_on_a_paper.html)).

This Comment Article does not substantively continue the discussion in a way that

contributes to advancing scientific understanding of hydrologic and Earth system processes. Rather, this comment article makes some significant assertions in an effort to refute or cast doubt on the findings summarized in the original published paper (Penny et al., 2018), while simultaneously not providing adequate support for those assertions.

Finally, and most importantly, the tone of the comment article does not contribute to the scientific discourse. Throughout the comment there are comments, asides, and phraseology that seemingly disparages the authors and their capabilities. An effective comment article would have adopted a collegial tone and focused on substantively continuing discussion in a way that is productive to the hydrologic science community.

---

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

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

