

Interactive comment on “Stochastic Hydrogeology’s Biggest Hurdles Analyzed and Its Big Blind Spot” by Yoram Rubin et al.

Yoram Rubin et al.

rubin@ce.berkeley.edu

Received and published: 10 September 2018

Thank you for your review and we are glad you enjoyed our paper. Our paper started off with a review of two previous opinion/review paper series, but the intent was to dive deeper into the question of why stochastic methods are hardly adopted by practitioners. Beyond merely stating our opinions and providing a handful of examples, we sought to provide the evidence to paint a thorough picture of the situation from multiple angles - a feat that required research. We researched, categorized, and described a plethora of software packages to assess the situation of software availability. We researched higher education programs and their instructional support for stochastic methods. We researched bibliometrics statistics to quantify research collaboration patterns. We researched legal opinions on uncertainty in environmental regulation. Due to the multiple

C1

angles that we pursued, and more importantly the depth into each, we respectively argue that this paper is a research article. In the descriptions of HESS manuscript types, it states that research articles "report on original research which clearly advances our understanding of hydrological processes and systems, and/or their role in water resources management" - we contend that, although our paper is not a traditional scientific research paper, it does advance our understanding of what roadblocks there are in the role of hydrological research in water resources management.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-290>, 2018.

C2