

## ***Interactive comment on “Technical note: Pitfalls in using log-transformed flows within the KGE criterion” by Léonard Santos et al.***

**B. Schaepli (Editor)**

bettina.schaepli@unil.ch

Received and published: 9 July 2018

Dear Colleague

I appreciate your active contribution to the public discussion of this manuscript. However, I think that in the future, you might want to adapt your comment writing style to such a public discussion.

You question the qualification of the reviewers that I have invited to review this paper (“manuscript needs to be reviewed by qualified referees”), which I can accept (even if I do not agree). **This does however not belong to a public discussion.** Furthermore, a technical note does not imply a different review process from any other paper, it is a different manuscript type (“this is a technical note, the need for more technical

C1

evaluation by the referees is required”)

And I would like to underline that **a constructive public review process** can indeed be accompanied by statements about whether a reviewer likes a paper. In any case, it is certainly not the role of a public comment to tell colleagues how they should review a paper.

Your short comment also implies that there are some open questions about the original idea of the KGE efficiency criterion. (“As far as I remember, in 2006, this piece of idea was introduced by a graduate student. Therefore, respecting Mr. Donald Trump’s intention of preventing people from stealing someone’s ideas/works/technologies, it would be more appropriate for the authors to evaluate the originality of Gupta et al. (2009)’s work.”). Again, this public discussion is certainly not the place to discuss this kind of issues.

Regarding your more technical comments, I invite the authors of the paper to answer your comments / questions.

---

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-298>, 2018.

C2