

Interactive comment on “Water supply patterns in two agricultural areas of Central Germany under climate change conditions” by M. H. Tölle et al.

Anonymous Referee #1

Received and published: 9 June 2012

Reading your reply on my general comments, the scientific merits of your study became clearer to me. Make sure that you write the revision in a way that explanation beyond the manuscript will not be necessary, i.e. that the ‘story’ becomes clear from the manuscript. (C8)

You write ‘However, the bias correction approach assumes that the biases in the model for the observed period remain the same in the future.’ How do you contribute to resolve this issue? (C9)

Your mention ‘Nobody has shown this analysis for these areas before ...’. To me this argument is not sufficient. I guess you mean that you look at these regions as case studies from which you can derive general statements and conclusions. This would, however needed to be demonstrated in the discussion. For which areas/applications

C1850

are your findings representative? (C10)

In your answer to my comment C2 you refer to the objectives of your research project. Please consider distinguishing between reporting from your project from writing an article on a specific scientific subject. I would strongly suggest concentrating here on the latter. To me the project goals are less relevant for this manuscript than the question, what did you actually to discuss here. The SPI this is not bioenergy crop specific. You write ‘The biological aspects are therefore negligible at this stage, but will be addressed later.’ What comes later is irrelevant for this manuscript. So then keep it as it is, a generalized assessment of biological effects rather than a contribution to the special question of bioenergy cropping or add some material that makes this analysis specific for bioenergy cropping. (C11)

‘p5157, l 25: Why ‘field areas’ Answer: Why not? We can rename it into “bioenergy areas” The appropriate term would be ‘(bioenergy) cropping areas’, I guess. (C12)

‘p5162, l5: ‘The climate change signal of SPI’-> ‘The SPI’ Answer: We do not agree with the suggested improvement: it is not the SPI itself that demonstrates the “wetting” of the winter in future, but the SPI-change.’ I understand, but then you should probably write ‘the change in future SPI’ (C13)

I appreciate your answers to C6 and C7. Make sure that the answer to C7 enters the discussion in the manuscript.(C14)

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 9, 5153, 2012.