I thank all reviewers for their efforts.

The paper can be accepted for publication into HESS subject to **minor revisions** based on the reviewer comments and recommendation and the additional evaluation of the editor.

The paper has been reviewed by two experts within the hydrological community and one who is less familiar with the hydrological literature. "The paper describes a new approach to assessing the uncertainty of flood forecasts based on quantile regression methods" (ref Rogier Koenker). All reviewers have been favourable and for example stated that "the paper is well written and interesting" (ref Ezio Todini). It " gives a clear and useful presentation of the approach and it may be beneficial to other hydrologic forecasting groups who are limited to deterministic forecast approaches" *(Reviewer #2)

The "main criticism of the paper is that it is insufficiently clear about how the estimation and plotting was carried out." (ref Rogier Koenker) and hence more detail will need to be provided in a revised version. In addition, the paper needs to be embedded better into current scientific literature and provide a more "critical view on pros and cons" (ref Ezio Todini) to become a full scientific paper. The authors promise to "extend … [their] discussion on this issue by clarifying that … [their] approach focuses on single model forecasts and will include the suggested references" (response by authors to reviewer Ezio Todini). The authors also respond well to the other points made by the reviewers.

Formal Manuscript Rating and Recommendation

1) Scientific Significance

Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of this journal (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?

0X Excellent   2X Good   1X Fair   0X Poor

2) Scientific Quality

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)?

0X Excellent   1X Good   0X Fair   0X Poor

3) Presentation Quality

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)?

0X Excellent   2X Good   1X Fair   0X Poor

For final publication, the manuscript should be

0X accepted as is

1X accepted subject to technical corrections

2X accepted subject to minor revisions

0X reconsidered after major revisions

0X rejected

Florian Pappenberger