

## ***Interactive comment on “Do users benefit from additional information in support of operational drought management decisions in the Ebro basin?” by Clara Linés et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 25 June 2018

This paper studies the value of extra information regarding water availability for drought management decisions, focusing on reservoir managers and irrigators. This is an interesting topic and the outputs of the work are relevant to the scientific community. However, there are a few issues in the current version that need to be explained further so the manuscript can be ready for publication.

In Section 2.1, when describing your study area, it would be nice to add something related to how droughts have impacted this basin in the past and what were the implications for agriculture in the area.

In Section 2.2.1, there is hardly any information about how many people do they

C1

interview from each group (reservoir operators, irrigators), what type of questionnaire/survey method was used (you mentioned it briefly in the discussion but I think it should be explained here in more detail), etc. I think this is needed to understand a bit better how the assumptions you are making in your model are representing the sector. Authors acknowledged that doing a larger survey would be ideal although out of the scope of the work. But still I think readers need to know more about the survey process. Also, they stated that irrigators are very different in their risk aversion levels and this will affect their decisions during a drought. Without information of the sample, readers might wonder if the participants in the survey are representing that spread.

In page 13, line 4, you said that you explore different thresholds "keeping the same thresholds at each of the four points where the farmers make decisions during the season". However, in page 16, you give different thresholds for Nov, Feb, April and May. Could you clarify this?

In Table 3, is there any way authors can add some kind of information to show how dry or wet each of the years under study was. From what I understood, 05 and 06 will be drier years as even with high allocation factors the result is not very good...But maybe adding some information (e.g., a standardized precipitation index) could help to interpret the results.

Figure 4, after looking at it a few times, is still a bit confusing to me. Authors could review the explanation of it and/or the presentation of it to make it easier to follow.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-241>, 2018.

C2