

In this revised version of the paper the authors successfully address the sources of concern that were raised during the first review process. In particular, the methodology adopted for the analysis is now convincing and the terminology more consistent. Moreover, the lack of clarity that was sometimes perceived in the original version of the manuscript has been resolved by providing additional information and explanations.

I enclose hereafter a short list of suggestions that the authors may want to consider before final publication.

Page 4, line 5: "... a catchment's TTD, ...". Missing apostrophe.

Page 4, line 27: "... ratios (Tetzlaff et al., 2009a) ...". Missing space before the parenthesis.

Page 14, Eq. 9: The authors may want to stick to the name of the variables previously introduced. There seems to be no particular reason to rename KGE' to E and KGE^- to E_r

Page 19, line 4: The number of the section is not visualised.

Page 21, line 2: "... isotope data, directly measured ...". A comma seems more appropriate than a semicolon.

Page 25, line 11: "..., it would appear to be essential to take ...".