What is the expected conclusion of the hydrological calibration?

* Does it work? What does “work” here mean?

>>> Work means the FDC improve in comparison with the original method, by what percentage?

>>> Work means the hydro-calibrated rainfall stats is not compromised

>>> Work means it is better than the original method when doing validation. If so then make a comparison case study.

* How significant is this hydrological calibration study? It certainly will not replace the traditional calibration of rainfall model because it does need the input from the traditional calibration.

Structure of paper

* Motivation: what are the current problems with rainfall model development and ways to assess the problem and ways to solve those problems
* A way to solve those problems is to perform hydrological calibration. Where does this fit? When traditional calibration does not work in terms of producing streamflow attributes
* Concepts to be addressed: continuous simulation, what is “good” rainfall model, what is “good” streamflow simulation, rainfall – runoff relationship, virtual observed streamflow, hydrological calibration, assessment method/strategy/criteria.
* Methodology: calibration then validation on selected streamflow attributes. Indications on other streamflow attributes that were not being modelled.
* Expected outcome: the hydrological calibration provides a new set of rainfall model parameters that improve the production of streamflow statistics (flow duration curves, what else? What are other statistics that it may compromise or may not compromise or may complement?) in comparison to the traditional calibration procedure.

Overall questions: should aim 1: hydrological calibration pilot study incorporate aim 2: effect of rainfall-runoff model choice on the hydrological calibration procedure

* If not then aim 2 would be a comparison study between different RRO models