

Interactive comment on “A history of the concept of time of concentration” by Keith J. Beven

Keith Beven

k.beven@lancaster.ac.uk

Received and published: 6 February 2020

- The historical overview of past works is especially useful as past works are often forgotten now 1000s of hydrology papers are published annually. However, at times I was hoping that a more systematic overview (e.g. a table) of key papers was provided in addition to the story tying old papers together. However, I understand this may not be the purpose of a paper for this special issue (and more appropriate for a review

Response: Clearly there have been a huge number of papers that refer to time of concentration so a Table, even of key papers, would be rather long. A number of previous review papers are cited, including some relatively recent ones. These did not really discuss the different interpretations brought out here, or account for the resulting differences in estimates (as with the Grimaldi et al. paper noted below). So I think that telling the historical story and making that differentiation is the important aspect of this

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



paper.

- Can it somewhere be made clear if the outlined misunderstanding of the time of concentration underlies the big quantitative differences (i.e. 500%) that have been reported by Grimaldi 2012?

Response: Will do in revision

- L25: would it be useful to have a proper Wikipedia citation that also includes the time and date this page was accessed, because the Wikipedia page may change over time (for example due to this article)
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Citing_Wikipedia

Response: Of course. Will give latest access when revising paper

Line 370: replace “Berghuis” by “Berghuijs”

Response: Thanks for catching that

k

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2019-588, 2020>.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

