Water Resources Research

Published by the American Geophysical Union

Dr. William G. Gray, Editor
Water Resources Research
303A Cushing Hall of Engineering
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556-0767
USA

Tammy E. Burns, Editor's Assistant
18B Fitzpatrick Hall of Engineering
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
574-631-8602 (p), 574-257-7584 (fax)
wrr@nd.edu (e-mail)

July 3, 2002

MS001045: Climate Change, Hurst Phenomenon and Hydrologic Statistics

Dr. Demetris Koutsoyiannis
National Technical University
Faculty of Civil Engineering
Department of Water Resources
Heroon Polytechneiou 5
GR-157 80 Zografou, Athens
GREECE

Dear Dr. Koutsoyiannis:

Enclosed please find two reviews of the above-referenced manuscript, a resubmission of 000679. The Associate Editor who has been involved in the review process has also provided an assessment as follows:

> Both reviewers #1 and #2 have significant difficulties with the paper. Their concerns are similar. First, and most importantly, it is not clear how the Hurst exponent can be estimated reliably, yet its knowledge is needed for using the methods put forward in this paper. Also, it is unclear how to discriminate between alternative models that may exhibit a similar behavior but may not all be SSS scaling processes. There are also problems with the discussion of deterministic versus stochastic behavior as pointed out by reviewer #2. Both reviewers recognize that the new estimator is potentially appealing but significantly more work would have to be done before the material becomes publishable. I concur with this assessment. I also note that most of the reviewers' concerns are similar to those on the original paper.

When a paper that has been rejected is resubmitted, it is essential that significant progress be made in addressing the review comments and improving the manuscript. It seems that you have not chosen to heed the comments of the reviewers. This certainly is your right as an author who has responsibility for presenting his work. However, your objectives and the guidance received from the review team seem to be at odds. Therefore, I think that you should pursue publication of this work elsewhere. I do not think there is value in another iteration on this paper with *WRR*. I am therefore making a final decision to decline this manuscript in its current and any future revised forms. I do think that if you will give the review comments careful consideration and try to present your work to advantage, you may end up with a good paper. I hope that the *WRR* review process has helped you along these lines.

Sincerely yours,

William G. Gray
Editor, WRR

Enc. 2 reviews

cc: AE
DE
file