

Interactive comment on “Practical experience and framework for sensitivity analysis of hydrological models: six methods, three models, three criteria”

by Anqi Wang and Dimitri P. Solomatine

Anqi Wang and Dimitri P. Solomatine

wanganqi0718@163.com

Received and published: 28 March 2018

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank all referees and the Editor for the time given to review this paper, pointing out deficiencies, and providing the very valuable suggestions, especially on the ways to deepen the analysis and improve the interpretation of results.

Our intention was, as it can be seen from the title, to present the “practical experience and framework”, and to provide additional orientation for practitioners among a variety of methods, who could follow the logical framework/workflow and assess what

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



methods to use and why. We aimed to stress explicitly effectiveness, efficiency and convergence, as the important criteria for comparison, but it appears we were not convincing enough. We appreciate the recommendations of the referees and accept that in the present form the study is not in the form to be presented as a “research paper” in HESS.

We will be evaluating our options concerning extension and deepening of this research (which requires time and resources), the objectives, positioning, and the target audience of this paper.

Interactive comment on *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-78>, 2018.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

