
ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommend as part of the revision.

ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name:	Email:
Date Manuscript Received: 02.11.2016	Date Manuscript Review Submitted:
Manuscript Title: IMPACT DU CHANGEMENT CLIMATIQUE SUR L'ÉVOLUTION DE L'ÉROSIVITÉ DES PLUIES DANS LE RIF OCCIDENTAL (NORD DU MAROC)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1187/16	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a brief explanation for each 3-less point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	X

<i>My ability to read French is not sufficient to evaluate this</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>See my major comments to the authors below – the comparison between future and current climate requires some indication on how well each regional climate model reproduces the present-day rainfall and R factor</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(a brief explanation for 3-less point rating)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revisions needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

This is an interesting work. I do have a major comment on the methodology. You have compared the future scenarios directly with the present-day conditions. However, this could lead to uncertainties, since the climate models do not exactly represent the reference conditions (this is why, many times, the climate model results are either corrected or compared directly with the climate simulations for the reference period). To be complete, this article requires a note on the accuracy of climate models in represent the present-day rainfall (and eventually R) for 1960-1990 when compared with the observed data.

Ideally the data could be downloaded and analyzed for 1960-1990, but in alternative the accuracy of

these models has been evaluated (in the PRUDENCE and ENSEMBLES projects) and this model evaluation literature should be analyzed to provide information on the uncertainty associated with climate model predictions for rainfall, i.e. do they overestimate or underestimate rainfall? Are there seasonal differences? Etc.

Minor comments/suggestions:

PP. 5: did you analyze if both rainfall stations had similar event characteristics in the periods where they have data, to see the quality of the rainfall replacement? Please detail.

Table 3: it'd be good to have something to evaluate the RMSE against; I suggest adding the standard deviation of observed values, or the average.

Comments and Suggestions to the Editors Only:

