

Interactive comment on “Water use scenarios as a tool for adaptation to climate change of a water supply company” by R. Jacinto et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 19 March 2013

The paper concentrates on the calculation of water use scenarios in Portugal, based on European climate change models. The paper is well written and can be excepted for publication when the following changes are implemented: - Pg 266; be more general in the abstract and less specific and change the abstract accordingly to the comments below. - Pg 267, line 2: “policy” must be “political” - Pg 267, line 11: must be “households’ and industrial efficiency” - Pg 267, line 22: introduce EPAL - Pg 267, line 26: inserte “future” before “water availability” - Pg 267, line 28: “will evaluate” should be “evaluated” - Pg 268, line 4: delete footnote (does not give extra information) - Pg 268, line 5-6: “all other systems” only refers to one: “agriculture”, give more examples - Pg 268, line 6: introduce “ICPP SRES” (not only in abstract) and avoid to times “scenarios” in one sentence. - Pg 268, line 7-8: delete “These. . . our results” (no extra information) - Pg 268, line 15: explain what is meant by “linear regionalization”. - Pg 268, line 17-22: avoid

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



numbering here (insert bullets) and diminish line spacing - Pg 269, line 1-5: delete “the evolution . . . consumer behaviour” (repetition). - Pg 269, line 6: explain what is meant by “downscaling” - Pg 269, line 14: insert “future” before “water consumption” - Pg 269, line 14: “is” should be “was” (simple past when done by authors) - Pg 269, line 16: avoid numbering (see above) - Pg 269, line 8: “base population” should be “population database” - Pg 269, line 22-25: unclear what is meant by this sentence - Pg 270, line 1: insert “(CLC, 2000)” after “Corine Land Cover” and delete footnote - Pg 270, line 9: delete “mostly” - Pg 271: Make “water use projections” part of Materials and Methods section, thus 2.3. - Pg 271, line 3: “applicable” should be “applied” and “in this project” should be “to this region” - Pg 271, line 11: “were made” should be “was done” and delete “presented” - Pg 271, line 17: delete “significant” (there is no statistical proof) - Pg 271, line 21: Explain scenarios and refer to table - Pg 272, line 23; “by” should be “per” - Pg 273, line 9: delete “significant” (no statistical proof) - Pg 273, line 10: indicate how much reduction of agricultural land and increase in urban area. - Pg 273, line 11-14: This is not part of the “results” but rather something to mention with the scenarios (see above). - Pg 273, line 15: “in the” should be “from”. - Pg 273, line 17: “in” should be “from” and “is possible to see” should be “can be concluded” - Pg 273, line 18: “are coincident” should be “coincide” - Pg 273, line 19-20: “to maintain” should be something like “grassland will be maintained on the same level” - Pg 273, line 24: “shows” should be “showed” - Pg 273, line 25: delete “also” and “significant” should be “large” - Pg 274, Line 3: “are” should be “were” - Pg 274, line 5-6: delete “which. . . developments” (this is obvious and inherent to scenarios) - Pg 274, line 6: “project” should be “projected” - Pg 274, line 7: “sectors analysed” should be “analysed sectors” - Pg 274, line 9: delete “for example” - Pg 274, Line 11: “are” should be “were” - Pg 274, Line 13: “decrease” should be “decreased” - Pg 274, Line 20: “analysis” should be “account” - Pg 274, line 22: delete “the” - Pg 274, line 24: insert “the” before “summer” - Pg 274, line 20 and Pg 275, line 3-5: there is a contradiction, first is said “the results need to be considered carefully” and afterwards “the result show..previously expected”. - Pg 274: What is missing is a discussion about the impact for EPAL and the water supply (see

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)

title the paper). - Pg 275, line 7: start the conclusions part with a small summary of the work done. - Pg 275, line 7: delete “considered” - Pg 275, Line 8: “Another. . .that” should be “Mainly” - Pg 275, line 10-21: this is more a discussion than a conclusion. In the conclusion you should state the most important findings from the results and discussion section.

Interactive comment on Drink. Water Eng. Sci. Discuss., 5, 265, 2012.

DWESD

5, C321–C323, 2013

Interactive
Comment

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

C323

