

The authors have taken into account the criticisms and suggestions of both referees that resulted in significant improvement of the paper. I recommend the revised paper for publication subject to technical corrections listed in the last review of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Referee.

<b>Principal Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent (1)</b>	<b>Good (2)</b>	<b>Fair (3)</b>	<b>Poor (4)</b>
<b>Scientific Significance:</b> Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of <i>Hydrology and Earth System Sciences</i> (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?		+		
<b>Scientific Quality:</b> Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (consideration of related work, including appropriate references)?		+		
<b>Presentation Quality:</b> Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well-structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of English language)?		+		

Alexander Gelfan  
 Handling Editor