Reviewer 3 Todini

We would like to thank prof. Todini for his feedback and comments. Below we answer to the issues raised.

1) The paper is focused on single valued forecasts which is the reason not to include the references to multimodel papers. We will extend our discussion on this issue by clarifying that our approach focuses on single model forecasts and will include the suggested references;

2) The suggestion to compare our novel method with other presented methods in the scientific literature is very useful. However, given the fact that the use of our QR-based approach is novel to hydrological forecasting, the main goal of this manuscript is to present and validate the QR approach for hydrological forecasting purposes. Intercomparison with other methods within this manuscript would in our opinion distract the reader from our main message; Currently, we are working on intercomparison of predictive uncertainty methods for both single value and ensemble forecasts and we hope to report on this work soon both in scientific journals and in future HEPEX and other meetings (i.e. EGU); (see also reply to reviewer 2);

3) To answer this point of the reviewer, an investigation was also performed to see if it was better to perform the linear regression on transformed forecast errors or on the forecasted values themselves. The analysis was carried out for Welshbridge (2077) in the Upper Severn. Table 1 shows the results, from which it can be seen that the regression on forecast errors performs better especially at higher measured water levels which is the area of most interest.

Table 1 Comparisons of observations within respective confidence intervals (5%-95%) for Welshbridge using two regression approaches

Lead time [hr]	Water level interval [m]	Regression based on forecast errors	Regression based on forecasted values
12	All values	90.5	92.7
	0-1	90.2	92.3
	1-2	92.1	98.5
	2-3	91.6	87.4
	3-4	68.0	56.0
	4+	100.0	0.0
24	All values	89.7	91.6
	0-1	90.3	92.2
	1-2	89.1	97.8
	2-3	90.6	77.1
	3-4	76.0	44.0

	4+	83.3	33.3
36	All values	87.4	87.6
	0-1	84.6	87.7
	1-2	92.3	91.3
	2-3	94.8	82.5
	3-4	76.0	48.0
	4+	100.0	66.7
48	All values	85.9	87.8
	0-1	81.8	88.7
	1-2	92.3	92.0
	2-3	96.9	76.5
	3-4	84.0	44.0
	4+	83.3	33.3

We will not include the table above but we will stress and discuss this point in the revised manuscript (see also reply to comments reviewer 2);

4) We will add a statement on the amount of parameters and include a reference to MCP with the remark it might even be more parsimonious than the approach taken here. As said before the NQT approach as developed here prevents subjective choices on error models and results in our opinion in parsimonious error relations.

5) The results shown by the reviewer may explain the results in Table 1. And makes it even more justifiable to use forecast errors instead of using the forecasted values themselves. At the moment of submission this paper was not publically available. When the paper mentioned by the reviewer is available we could include a reference to that paper when discussing point 3) above.