



Interactive comment on “SuperflexPy 1.2.0: an open source Python framework for building, testing and improving conceptual hydrological models” by Marco Dal Molin et al.

Andrew Wickert (Editor)

awickert@umn.edu

Received and published: 19 March 2021

Many thanks to the authors for their thoughtful responses to the review comments. I invite a revised submission, and include a few notes on the general high-level responses below. Where I do not include notes, you may assume that I approve of your plan for moving forward. I have read but not commented on your responses to each individual referee.

- **MP2 - Detailed comparison with existing frameworks:** I understand the hesitancy with regard to a large comparison that would, I agree, not be the focus

of a model description paper. A table of different existing packages and a short discussion, or something like this, should suffice.

- **1.3 MP3 - Degree of details: balance of content between the paper and the documentation:** I agree that referencing the documentation would be helpful to the reader. However, if you expect the code and documentation to evolve over the next 5-10 years, I would caution against detailed cross-referencing (e.g., of sections), unless you are explicit about the links with the version of record. This is in order to match the static paper with the potential evolution of a useful modeling tool.
- **1.5 MP5 - The representation of substance transport:** Agreed, and focus on the capabilities more than the aspirations (though you can include appropriate motivation).

Interactive comment on Geosci. Model Dev. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gmd-2020-409>, 2020.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper