Specific comments / suggestions

1. Section 2 – I would suggest the authors to also add a sentence about the precipitation pattern over the catchment (annual rainfall / snow accumulation, number of wet days in a year, etc.) beside the reference to Fig. 1.
2. Section 3.2 – Beside the reference to Wilks and Wilby you should also mention that the single location simulation is describe in the supplementary.
3. Section 3.3.2 – Change 10'000 to 10,000.
4. Section 4.1.2 – I have fitted the daily precipitation data from SAE station (last 10 years) for the mixture exponential model, mixed Gamma and GP distribution and hybrid Gamma and GP distribution. Best fit (AICc criteria) was reached with the Mixed exponential distribution, same distribution used by the authors. Therefore, the authors can consider deleting the sentence "This issue could be overcome by more sophisticated amount models combining e.g. a Gamma with a Generalized Pareto distribution (Vrac and Naveau, 2007)".
5. Discussion – the NHMM can provide a solution of two states for the same synoptic system, such as one will account for precipitation in only part of the catchment while the other will apply for a case in which all catchment is wet (or dry). I admit that it will be a difficult task to calibrate the NHMM for this solution and almost impossible to use the model to project future climate in this case, but it is an option. I would suggest to refine the last part of the paragraph that the authors have add.
6. Figure 1 – I think the authors can present this figure much better. I guess that the blue lines/polygons represents streams and lakes? If so, a label of some of them could be helpful. Grey polygon – Switzerland borders? It needs to be clarify.