

Interactive comment on “A meteo-hydrological modelling system for the reconstruction of river runoff: the case of the Ofanto river catchment” by Giorgia Verri et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 13 June 2017

General comments

The paper deal with a hydro-meteorological modelling system in order to simulate the river runoff in the Ofanto basin in the Puglia region, Southern Italy during two episodes: one between January and March 2011 and the second between November and December 2013. I found the paper interesting to be publish in the NHESS journal. The use of WRF-Hydro is wide spreading in the scientific community and I appreciate also the effort to describe in the appendix A and B mathematical formulas of algorithm and processes. However, a major review has to be done; in particular, the authors have to better clarify some parts that are not clear and are missing in the text (see below).

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



Specific comments

The paper is readable and understandable, but I suggest to take care about punctuation marks and changing of the paragraph, since some sentences are not linked between each other, see for instance P2 L25-28, P5, L1-3, P7 L 18-21. Furthermore, some parts in the text are not clear, for instance: P4, L25: Have you ever carried out a calibration and validation with this hydro-meteorological chain in previous years? Or, as it seems, you calibrate and validate only and during these two events? P8, L23-24: Why did you not maintain equal the lead time of forecast? As also reported in table 2, where it is written that for the event 1 the simulation starts 2 days before the main peak and for the event 2 on the same day? How do you conclude that “the WRF needs to be re-initialized approximately 1.5 days earlier”? Is there anything that, for the sake of brevity, it is not reported in the text? P9, L17-24: Here, you compare the results of your experiments with values of other researches carried out in different areas, basins, etc. I did not understand this comparison: have you tried the 3D-Var assimilation on the Ofanto river basin? P10, L24: In which period did you carry out the calibration? I would clarify better these parts in the text. Take care that there are lots of parameters and variable you introduced in your analysis: maybe it is better to focus on a few of them? Finally, a general check to the figures and tables is strictly recommended.

Technical Corrections

P1, L11: Add a comma after “however” and please the same in rest of the text P1, L20: remove “in” P2, L1: Please, choose to write Apulia or Puglia in the whole text P2, L4: replace “with” with “between” P2, L7: I suggest: “. . .validation procedures, but they need. . .” P2, L9: In addition, . . . P2, 10: . . .catchments, but. . . P2, L13: The term embed is it appropriate? I suggest “take into account” P2, L16: I suggest to replace “end result” with “final result” P2, L19: . . .and, thus, . . . P2, L22: Finally, . . . P3, L9: Remove “thus” P3, L14: I suggest: . . .river runoff, and the evaluation. . . P3, L15: I suggest: predictions P3, L16-19: I would not begin a new paragraph P3, L22: I suggest: The Ofanto river basin P3, L22: What do you want to mean with “relocatable”

P3, L25: dry season, but may. . . P3, L27: Please, add a space between numbers and units. Check it in the rest part of the paper. P3, L28: I would write 720 mm without year, since you wrote it is an annual mean rainfall P3, L32: I suggest: "...a small village, located at 715 m above the sea level." P4, L6: I suggest "four" in letters and not in number and in rest of the paper as well. P4, L8: In particular, the Calitri gauge. . . P4, L8: Replace "and" with "which" P5, L2: I would not begin a new paragraph P5, L12: after "thus", "overall", "in addition", "however", please add a comma in the text P5, L31: replace "in" with "on" P6, L18: I suggest: "...precipitation is crucial for the reconstruction. . ." P8, L10: I suggest "these" instead of "both" P8, L16: initialization time in small letters P9, L9: please add here a reference after Yucel and Senatore P9, L17: The acronym for the WRF-ASS, it is not introduced P10, L17. I suggest: "...0 and 1.0, where values equal to 1.0 mean that. . ." P12; 32: I suggest: The study also highlighted. . . P13, L15: Please change with "hydro-meteorological variables" P15, L6: I suggest: "...coefficients: the first. . . P16, L22: Please, add a space after "section". P16, L28: area not ar,ea P16, L29: remove "is" P24, Figure: the font of letters is too small. Please, increase it. The legend of the top panel goes from 0 to 4000 m a.s.l., but it seems that the highest altitude is much less: please review it. Then, is t worth to show the right panel? I cannot appreciate colours in the figure. P25, Figure 3: The hydro-meteorological modelling chain. P26, Figure 5: The coloured spots are the all available rain gauges previously shown in figure 2? Can you add the basin contour line? P27, Figure 6: I would use "dam" as unit of the geopotential height instead of "m/10" and °C instead of Cdeg. The same for Fig. 7. P28, Figure 8: replace "or" with "and" P29, Figure 9: Validation of the Ofanto discharge. . . P30, Figure 10: I would repeat in this figure as well the problem of missing data. The legend font is too small, also in figure 12 and 13.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-102>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

