

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

**B. Guse (Referee)**

bfguse@gfz-potsdam.de

Received and published: 2 July 2018

Review of the technical note "Pitfalls in using log-transformed flows within the KGE criterion" by Santos et al.

In this technical note, Santos et al. shows that the application of KGE is limited for log-transformed data. They shows some options to handle with this limitation. Santos et al. presented very clearly why the KGE is limited for log-transformed data. I like this technical note and have only some minor comments.

Minor comments:

P. 5, L. 28: The modelling period is subdivided into a calibration (2003-2008) and a validation period (2008-2013). Please make clear whether the year 2008 belongs to

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



the calibration or validation period.

Figs. 2-11: If possible, I recommend to add a header to the subplots. Since all these figures have a similar layout, it would be good to differentiate them in a clearer way. E.g. you may add “observations” and “simulations” as header to the subplots of Fig. 3.

Fig. 2-3: Maybe you can merge both figures by adding the information that you compare log-transformed and untransformed data.

Technical comments:

I recommend to avoid paragraphs with only one or two sentences such as on P.4, L. 20-27.

P. 13, L. 4: Please remove “pp.” in the Coron et al.

---

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

## HESSD

---

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

