

Interactive comment on “Coherence of Global Hydroclimate Classification Systems” by Kathryn L. McCurley Pisarello and James W. Jawitz

Kathryn L. McCurley Pisarello and James W. Jawitz

jawitz@ufl.edu

Received and published: 31 December 2020

We thank the reviewer for these helpful comments. The Reviewer comments are listed below, along with our response to each. Most comments require only minor edits. In some cases, we describe revisions to the manuscript (with line numbers), and we recognize that the revised manuscript is requested in a subsequent step.

Reviewer 3

The authors highlight the absence of a proper ET-derived classification system. It is a such that they propose a “series of ET-based global classifications that should yield

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



comparatively higher ET coherence than other systems”, by assessing coherence and shape complexity within the classifications. I find that the study is well carried out, very nicely written and illustrated. Methods are also well explained. I think that the study would be a great contribution to HESS, enabling researchers to choose the best system of classification suited to their purposes, specially regarding ET. However, I have some clarifications that need to be added to the former version of the manuscript.

Response: We thank the reviewer for the positive comments.

1. Existing so many proxies for landscape connectivity assessments the authors need to support the use of “zone area” and “zone fragmentation”. Why are these the best ones? Also, I did not see any formula, or explanation. This is needed wince these classification schemes are not that well known in the field of water resources, and rather in the field of ecology. A figure would be useful.

Response: This has been expanded in section 2.1 (lines 80-97).

2. ET is dependent on many local parameters related to land cover and land use (See for example Sterling et al., 2013). Human activities such as agriculture, urbanization, deforestation, heavily affect these parameters and then would imprint less coherence, more variability and patchiness into the classification system. The authors should comment/adjust on this.

Response: We now comment on this (lines 294-296). The suggested reference has been incorporated.

3. Furthermore, I would have done the analysis with a more “large-scale climatic parameter” that involves less spatial variability (and more spatial coherence-less CV) at the local scale, such as the aridity index (PET/P) or evaporative ratio (ET/P). Have the authors considered this?

Response: As the reviewer suggests, forming zones based on the aridity or evaporative index can be useful. As we use mean annual P, PET, and ET as metrics of coherence,

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



aridity and evaporative indices are thus captured indirectly. Note that in preliminary analyses we used aridity index to create zones but we found this to be a less robust way of forming zone boundaries compared to mean annual P and PET separately.

4. I was expecting a more concrete recommendation on the best system for ET. Which one is it if you have to choose one?

Response: As suggested by the reviewer, WEC is now more clearly put forward as our recommended framework (section 5, lines 333-340).

5. Conclusions are missing, and should be independent from the Discussion.

Response: This has been corrected.

References: Sterling, S.M., Ducharne, A., Polcher, J., 2013. The impact of global land-cover change on the terrestrial water cycle. *Nature Climate Change* 3, 385–390. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1690>

Interactive comment on *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-522>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

