

Interactive comment on “Cooperation of hydrologists from the Danube River Basin” by Stevan Prohaska et al.

Adrian Schmid-Breton (Referee)

adrian.schmid-breton@iksr.de

Received and published: 1 April 2020

Generally speaking the paper is very interesting and gives a clear and short information on the establishment, relations, process, deliveries and future challenges of the hydrologist cooperation of the Danube River. It is clearly structured and quite well referenced.

Here would be my suggestions for improvement: 1) Briefly mention the “administrative” Danube context: basin with most countries in the world (18 nowadays), located between west and (south)east europe, 2) Explain better the purpose of this study/this article (put it in perspective), thus in which context are you writing this article and for what purpose (can be general). Is your purpose solely to give a summary of the co-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



operation and to state some further developments and challenges? Or do you think that this paper and its subject could serve as an example for other rivers in the world? In what extension? This could help to understand why this article is important/useful for the science and/or practitioners (river basin managers, hydrologists, decision makers, ...). 2) Some information on your methodology and where did you search and found information for this paper would be interesting. 3) I am surprised that you did not mentioned the International commission for the protection of the Danube river (ICPDR) and its working group on hydrology and flood (but also the work of the ICPDR linked to climate change). It seems to me that the ICPDR is nowadays a major cooperation actor for the Danube river basin. If any it would be interesting to state in your article what are the links between the two cooperation platforms, if there are exchanging or using each others products/data, how are they exchanging (common person, meetings, ...), ... I think one paragraph on this aspects could be beneficial to the article. 4) As for the english, misprints or typos, an in-depth control is needed, some examples: - in the Abstract there are some sentences missing something like “established ??? common Cooperation” or “In addition, Cooperation (???) produce several reports and two books.” - in chapter 4 on page 6/7 the list of resolutions from the meeting is not correctly quoted and structured: brackets seems not at the right place, there are some “we adopted ...” which are strange etc. This list of resolutions could be also shortened. 5) I am missing like Mr. Mostert a short conclusion.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2020-66>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

