

Dear Editor,

Thank you for considering to accept the manuscript once it is revised for editorial and grammatical considerations.

We have now updated the manuscript according to your wishes:

- The paper has been through a thorough language check by a native English speaking professional interpreter. Through this process it was basically re-written so it was not meaningful to submit another version with track changes.
- We have followed the guidelines for publication in HESS (for instance regarding the use of a space for thousands separation in line 150)
- We more carefully describe how we use the various climate scenarios when we refer to them, for example, by putting the term “forcing” after the model names ECHAM and Hadley.
- We are more consistent with the use of “sites” versus “gaging sites” versus “gauges” throughout the text.
- For figures, we more carefully describe abbreviations in the legends in the figure captions.
- We are more specific when using the word “significant” when it refers to the results from the trend tests, by writing “statistically significant”, for instance in section 3.1 and 3.2. We also refer more frequently to Table 1 and Table 2, showing the results from the trend test.
- We use +/- instead of phrases like “between 30% increase and 30% decrease.

In addition:

- We have corrected some minor errors in the text and in the figure legends.

We sincerely hope that this paper is now ready for publication in HESS.

Merry Christmas!

/ Berit Arheimer and Göran Lindström