Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.,
https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-241-RC2, 2018

Hydrology and Earth System Sciences
Discussions

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 #2

Received and published: 23 July 2018

I have approached "Do users benefit from additional information in support of operational drought management decisions in the Ebro basin?" by Clara Linés and co few times by now. The paper touches a very timely topic and (it seems that it) takes an interesting approach to quantify the value of different information attributes on decisions that various stakeholder can take across various spatial scales. The paper demonstrates application of the methodology is Ebro River Basin in northern Spain, which is highly regulated and intervened by socio-economic activities, in particular irrigated agriculture and hydropower generation. As far as the context of the paper is concerned, the paper is certainly inline with aims and scope of HESS and can attract a large portion of the journal's readership. However, at this stage the paper suffers from major

issues. In particular, the paper is quite disorganized in terms of sectioning and the sequence of materials provided. Second, it seems that presentation in the paper lacks effective strategy, which hinders the reader to get involved with the paper. Finally, the level of details regarding the data obtained through interviews, methodology used for modeling, experimental setup and investigation made is quite low, in a way that the work is indeed not producible, if some one wants to apply the same approach in another case study. I do believe the paper should go under major revisions, in terms of the rationale and the content provided and resubmitted for another round of review, this time focusing on the specific results and findings.

Below, please see my specific comments

1) The paper is poorly written. The use of English can (and must) be improved in many parts of the paper (e.g. P1, line 8; P2, line 7-9 among others). In addition, it is very hard to read the whole paper in one sitting (at least I was not able to accomplish) due to long sentences and the existence of a lot of text. I strongly suggest a major editorial effort before the paper resubmitted.

2) It seems that the paper has missed positioning itself in the broader context of the current socio-hydrology research. On the one hand, review of previous studies in other parts of the world has been largely ignored. This includes for instance missing previous works on performing semi-structured interviews, developing decision support models through stakeholder engagement, and quantifying the value of information. The paper requires framing itself very clearly in the introduction.

3) The paper is extremely disorganized and is poorly sectioned. The section related to Results in particular is very long relative to other sections and is hard to follow. Most importantly, the results section includes even the results of semi-structured interviews that basically provides the data support for developing the decision model. I believe a great portion of what is presented in the results can go under a new section related to the data support and model development.

4) The way that paper presents the information and findings through text, tables and figures seems not very well thought. For example, a central part of this paper is the decision model, with which the value of new information can be assessed for various stakeholders. After reading the paper this part of the paper quite a few times, I am not still slightly clear about how the model has been developed. A schematic and some formulas would certainly help. To facilitate following the paper, I believe a standalone section is required to discuss the experimental setup and how the results should be viewed. Figures are very hard to understand. Similar to the other reviewer, I do also have problem with understanding Figures 4 (and 5 and 6 and 7). The discussion is also extremely long and rather scrambled. I believe synthesizing information under appropriate subsections would be very helpful.

5) While the paper is long, it does not provide information required to reproduce the work or to at least understand the process of data gathering through semi-structured interviews and model development. As noted above, it is not clear how the model has been developed as a result it is not possible to really examine the truthfulness of the results and the relevance of the discussion provided.

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