

Interactive comment on “Flash-flood forecasting in two Spanish Mediterranean catchments: a comparison of distinct hydrometeorological ensemble prediction strategies” by Béatrice Vincendon and Arnau Amengual

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 30 October 2017

This manuscript is a resubmission of an article previously withdrawn/rejected from HESSD.

<https://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2017-427/>

I was not involved in the HESSD review process.
The manuscript was thoroughly reviewed by two anonymous reviewers.
Some major issues have been raised.

C1

<https://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2017-427/hess-2017-427-RC1.pdf>
<https://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2017-427/hess-2017-427-RC2.pdf>

On September 22nd 2017 the authors uploaded the replies to the reviewers in which they anticipated that they would withdraw the manuscript from HESSD

<https://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2017-427/hess-2017-427-AC1.pdf>
<https://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/hess-2017-427/hess-2017-427-AC2.pdf>

I shortly summarize here the main reasons:

- “Unfortunately, we won’t be able to address all the points within the time of the review. We have to withdraw the paper.”
- “A correction of the paper by a native speaker cannot be achieved in the allotted time.”

On October 6th the paper with barely unchanged content was registered and uploaded to NHESSD.

The authors state that the paper “was previously submitted to HESS. However, the authors withdrawn it as the manuscript fits better in the scope of NHESS”.

The “iThenticate.com Similarity Report” showed 82 percent similarity to the HESSD paper. Some sentences have been added to accommodate minor literature requests, clarifications and typos mentioned by the HESSD reviewers.

C2

As the withdrawal from HESSD gave the authors the time to go through the points raised and complete a control by a native speaker, I am puzzled that the "same" manuscript is ready for a NHESD review about 10 working days later.

I am of the opinion that the points raised by the original HESSD reviewers are valid and need to be addressed. All people involved in the HESSD and NHESD review process (including the Copernicus team) allocate precious time in managing the submitted manuscripts. This deserve in my opinion more consideration than what you are showing in case of this manuscript.

This behaviour is harmful for the whole community and for the peer review process.

As you might understand, I am not willing to support this and ask you to consider withdrawing this manuscript too.

To the questions raised by the original reviewers (which I support) I have only one to add:

WHY acting like this?

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-353>, 2017.