

***Interactive comment on* “Global scenarios of irrigation water use for bioenergy production: a systematic review” by Fabian Stenzel et al.**

Fabian Stenzel et al.

stenzel@pik-potsdam.de

Received and published: 7 September 2020

We thank Mr. Hejazi for his helpful comments and suggestions. We will adopt the suggestions and add more to the rationale and take-away message of the paper.

More detailed responses:

Paragraph 1) We agree; we will carefully define and use the nomenclature, and will provide different figures for withdrawal and consumption.

Paragraph 2) We have not contacted the authors. As also mentioned in our comment to Referee 1, receiving and analyzing all these data would shed some more light on details of the individual studies. But we think it would not solve the issue that the methodologies (parameters of the studies) differ very much, still leaving us with the

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



broad range of results without being able to systematically identify the cause of this large spread. We will get back to this issue in more detail in our revised manuscript version, ultimately pointing to the necessity for model-intercomparison with standardized input datasets and assumptions.

Paragraph 3) Our intent was to synthesize the knowledge already out there. We absolutely agree that such a model-intercomparison would be the next step. We will highlight this more; see previous comment.

Paragraph 4) We only differentiate between different methodological approaches, the same model but with newer assumptions would be treated equally. Model advancements over time resulting in e.g. the water efficiency within studies of the same model might also require a much larger data basis.

Paragraph 5)/6) We appreciate your suggestions and will try to adopt them.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-338>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

