

Interactive comment on “Contribution of Potential Evaporation Forecasts to 10-day streamflow forecast skill for the Rhine river” by Bart van Osnabrugge et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 15 November 2018

In this paper, the authors explain the reason for their study by the fact that the influence of precipitation on forecasts has been studied most widely, while potential evapotranspiration (PET) have received little attention. Thus, they use a 20-year dataset of weather reforecasts and a daily hydrological model and to assess the importance of PET, they compare forecasts obtained with PET climatology (non-dated PET) with observation-based (dated) estimates of PET.

The authors modestly claim a "simple and straightforward investigation with an operational forecasting practice perspective".

The paper is perfectly written (I found only one typo p.6 l.10 "geostationairy"), and I

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



see nothing to add or change, except perhaps the reference to Makkink's paper in esperanto. In a century where young people often ignore this idealist-utopist linguistic movement, I think that Makkink's efforts could be rewarded by a citation !

The only critic that I could have made was that the conclusions are rather obvious... exactly the critic that I got for my 2004 paper on this topic... However I remember that I did not like the critic, so I withdraw mine. Moreover, what is obvious for older hydrologists is not obvious for everybody, and like André Gide wrote "everything has already been said, but since no one listens, one must always start again".

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-506>, 2018.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

