



Interactive  
Comment

## ***Interactive comment on “Assessing the operation rules of a reservoir system based on a detailed modelling-chain” by M. Bruwier et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 22 September 2014

Minor comments: - pag.5799 line 26: involved instead of involves. - pag.5800 line 1: up to 2050 and 2100. - pag.5800 line 7: hydropower production. - pag.5800 line 12: was used to model the flow in the rivers (instead of flow routing). - pag.5800 line 21: flows FOR 70 km. - pag.5801 line 22: It enables TO DERMINE reservoir levels (instead of to be determined). - pag.5803 line 15: the conservation of instead of maintaining. - pag.5803 line 21: active FOR A reservoir. - pag.5803 line 23: add a reference to Camnasio and Becciu 2011, concerning the consideration of exacts inflows, even if they are affected to uncertainty. - pag.5804 line 1: EXCEEDS instead of GETS EXCEEDED. - pag.5804 line 18: after the parenthesis use a comma instead of ;. - pag.5804 line 24: OF THE COMPUTED TIME SERIES. - pag.5804 line 27: LOW-flows. - pag.5804 line 28: eliminate "of the river". - pag.5806 line 26: eliminate the point, use a comma

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



before USING. - pag.5808 line 13: which is the percentage for the upper reach? It is not very clear to which quantity the percentage refer to. - pag.5810 line 12: eliminate LEVELS after reservoir. - pag.5810 line 15-17: the sentence is not very clear: please rephrase it. - pag.5811 line 3: eliminate IN THIS CASE. ... the increase of the threshold... instead of increasing. - pag.5811 line 10: catchment AREAS. - pag.5811 line 14: MAINLY instead of STRONGER. - pag.5812 line 15: eliminate WAS. - pag.5813 line 21: ABOUT instead of OF. - pag.5815 line 11: use a comma instead of ; after RISK.

Requests of clarification: - pag. 5802 line 20: Is there any reason for choosing to take into account only the results form 1974 to 2004? - pag. 5803 line 4: Is there any reason for using the GCM for Belgian catchments? - pag.5806 line 1: why do you consider Q100+15- pag.5806 line 11: The percentage of the relative damage is referred to what? - pag.5806 line 20: the usual concept of RISK consists in the product of propability of occourrence of a calamitous event by the expected damage. It seems to me that in this case you adopt a different definition of risk. Maybe you should find an other definition for the quantity you calculate here, in order not to create ambiguity with the common definition of risk. - pag.5813: I don't understand why the risk decrease of 6

---

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 2, 5797, 2014.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

