

Interactive comment on “Hybrid climate datasets from a climate data evaluation system and their impacts on hydrologic simulations for the Athabasca River basin in Canada” by Hyung-II Eum and Anil Gupta

Fuad Yassin

fuad.yassin@usask.ca

Received and published: 17 July 2019

This study addresses a relevant topic, particularly in Canada, where there is a huge limitation of reliable high-density observed climate data. Although I find the study very interesting, I have two important general comments that need better clarification. The first comment is that why other important data sources ignored in this study? If you look at the study of Wong et al. (2017), they demonstrated that GPCC and CRU data are good candidates in Canada compared to NARR. In their study, NARR was found to be the worst data set, and it is not clear why it is accounted in this study, while

C1

GPCC and CRU data present unique data globally with long-term and high-temporal resolution data. I believe a better explanation about this is needed, and accounting GPCC and CRU data would provide greater insight for the audience. My second observation is that why only few streamflow stations are used for proxy validation? My understanding is that there are many streamflow stations in the study area, especially around headwaters where huge variability and magnitude of precipitation expected.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-189>, 2019.

C2