

***Interactive comment on* “Evaluation of Low Impact Development and Nature-Based Solutions for stormwater management: a fully distributed modelling approach” by Yangzi Qiu et al.**

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 18 September 2019

I really do not understand your way in answering my comments. If I DID NOT UNDERSTAND and usually "OVERLOOK" the goals of your works, it means that you can not present the goal of your work in a proper way and you should try and work harder to let your goals clear for the readers.

"On the contrary, we agree that we have to revise our paper to", this statement is very strange, if you know that you need to revise your paper considering the comments "you added in your reply after this strange statement", my comment is (Why you did NOT do that before you submitted your paper), I hope that this comment is clear for you.

When I asked you to follow the same procedure "your current work from A to Z" to

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



be applied in another case study due to the fact you might find out that the drawn conclusion might be different in the other case study.

You applied a certain approach in a particular case study and achieve almost well-known outcomes, NOW, my clear comment is to apply this procedure in a different case study. Definitely, the case study should be different than the one you presented in your current work, show the results, discuss the findings and present that clearly in a revised version of this work.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-347>, 2019.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

