Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-67-RC2, 2020 © Author(s) 2020. This work is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.



## **ESSDD**

Interactive comment

## Interactive comment on "CAMELS-BR: Hydrometeorological time series and landscape attributes for 897 catchments in Brazil" by Vinícius B. P. Chagas et al.

## **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 28 April 2020

This study produced a new public large-sample hydrological dataset for Brazil. It reports streamflow and meteo timeseries from thousands of gauges, and more detailed catchment descriptions for a subset of 867 catchments, including descriptions on hydrological signatures, geology, soils, human intervention, and landcover. Conveniently these descriptions follow standards defined by the previous CAMELS (US) and CAMELS-CL datasets. In addition, to solely providing the data, the sources of the data, and potential limitations and pitfalls are discussed.

The paper reads very well and descriptions are generally clear. The approach seems sound and the dataset will be of much value to the hydrology community (and beyond).

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



Therefore the paper seems very suitable for publication in ESSD. I want to thank the authors for writing this very useful paper and providing this valuable dataset to the community.

I only have very few minor points that could be clarified (in addition to minor comments posted in the first review by Knoben):

- To what extent do the ET estimates match P-Q when several years of data are available. This might be good to know, to get a first-order idea if the estimates seem somewhat reasonable.
- "The mean daily precipitation in Brazil is highest in the Amazon and in Southern Brazil, where it usually exceeds 5 mm day-1" I would replace "usually" to "on average" since the first is more often associated with a median than a mean.
- Figures often refer to "fractions" (which suggest 0-1) when instead "percentages" are displayed. Either is fine, but it would be nice if the use was consistent.

Interactive comment on Earth Syst. Sci. Data Discuss., https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2020-67, 2020.

## **ESSDD**

Interactive comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper

