

Interactive comment on “Beyond Perrault’s experiments: Repeatability, didactics and complexity” by Stefano Barontini and Matteo Settura

Stefano Barontini and Matteo Settura

stefano.barontini@unibs.it

Received and published: 6 December 2019

We thank Prof. Okke Batelaan for the appreciation and the suggestions. We will account for the suggestions in a revised version of the paper, as we report in the point-to-point reply. For the sake of clarity, recalls of Reviewer’s suggestions are *emphasized* in the following notes:

1. *The language and structure of the text. . . and Although the paper does not focus. . .*: We will review the paper according to the suggestions, please see below for some details;

C1

2. *. . . add the reference to the English translation of Perrault’s work*: All the citations of Perrault’s opus have already been taken from La Roque’s 1967 translation, but we chose to cite it as Perrault (1967) and we did not note that the compiler missed the translation note in the references section. . . In a revised version we will explicitly recall the translation so that it will be findable by the reader;
3. *The abstract does not represent. . .*: The abstract will be modified according to the suggestion. Particularly we will shorten the first part (first two paragraphs), relieving its introductory style and better focusing on Perrault’s opus. Than we will better evidence which are the focus and the original contribution of the paper in the second part.
4. *The Introduction should better explain/summarize*: We will reorganize the Introduction according to the suggestion of firstly recalling Perrault’s main achievements and enlightening Nace’s (1974) contribution to their comprehension, and then of better detailing our focus. This will develop the first current 20 lines, which will increase in length. Therefore we plan also to enucleate the analysis of the cultural context at Perrault’s ages in a standing-alone section between the Introduction and current Section 2;
5. *The English grammar and spelling needs. . .*: English grammar and spelling will be thoroughly reviewed, too long sentences will be cut in order to make the paper better readable. In the current version of the paper we capitalized the subjects (Hydrology, Physics, etc.) according to a common usage in the historical and philosophical milieu. We would prefer to maintain this usage in a revised manuscript, but we will pay attention when it is misleading, as in the cases raised by the Reviewer, and in that cases we will rephrase the sentence;
6. *The studies conducted. . .*: We referred to naturalistic and philosophical studies. The sentence will be rephrased while reviewing the abstract;

C2

7. *P.6, line 21: Experiences?:* The word will be substituted with *experiments*, thanks for the note;
8. *Not all symbols. . . :* We will check all the symbols. Many of them were described in the Appendix, where most of the the equations are presented, but in doing so many symbols may be recognized after that they are found within the text. In a revised version of the paper we will fix this issue.
9. *. . . explanations of the experiments not very clear:* Sections 4 and 5 (actual numbers) will be reviewed in order to avoid such a lack of clarity;
10. *Add reference to La Roque:* Please refer to item 2 in this list.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-426>, 2019.