

Interactive comment on “On the social dynamics of moisture recycling” by Patrick W. Keys and Lan Wang-Erlandsson

M. Sivapalan (Editor)

sivapala@illinois.edu

Received and published: 11 March 2018

The authors have been well served by four critical but constructive reviews. It seems from the review comments that, at the minimum, the presentation of the present needs substantial improvement. The authors are in agreement and so I would like a substantially revised manuscript to be submitted so I can get the revised manuscript revised one more time by (hopefully) most of the previous reviewers.

However, I would like the authors to also pay attention to the main contributions of the paper. What has been learned from this that we did not know before, why is this research significant etc? In particular, in the abstract the authors state that this "... is part of an extension of the emerging discipline of socio-hydrology". In what way is

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



this an extension of socio-hydrology? The literature review of socio-hydrology is now substantial, although this is the first time there is work on focusing on atmospheric moisture recycling. Perhaps it is important to put this work in the context of what has been published before in socio-hydrology (I mean, if this is feasible). In spite of their claim, the literature cited is rather sketchy. Even if there is not an extensive literature review (there are other papers that do this already, e.g., Pande and Sivapalan in WIRES Water, Sivapalan and Bloeschl, WRR), it is important to draw a connection to previous work.

Apart from that, from my reading of the paper (including revised manuscript), I think the paper is very interesting, timely and eventually publishable, provided these comments can be satisfactorily addressed. Please submit a revised manuscript soon, so I can get it reviewed again promptly.

I look forward to receiving the revised manuscript soon.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Dynam. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/esd-2017-120>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

