

## Referee Report

### General Comments:

Both of these articles are relevant and could provide contributions to decision makers, as well as those working with ecosystem services and flood risk. The authors adequately addressed all of my concerns within the original submission making the subsequent paper much more suitable for publication. The separation of the original article into two greatly strengthens the study.

### Specific Comments:

**Abstract:** Abstracts need to be shortened. The abstracts are far too verbose as they stand. A more simplified abstract that excludes detailed discussions of equations/parameters will make them clearer and more engaging.

### PART I

**Figure 1:** This figure is much improved and far easier to follow, however it seems a little blurry. Misspelling of pathways at line 727. No explanation of step 10 in figure description.

**Figure 4:** This figure is blurry making the small text difficult to read.

**Avoid using contractions:** For example, “don’t” should be “do not”

**Lined 158:** change doess to does.

**Line 196:** “it’s” should be “its”

**Line 212:** “The probably simplest” to “A simple”

**Line 227-239:** The wording of this sentence is confusing and requires some revisions.

**Line 456:** “en” should be “an”

**Line 534-536:** Spell out authors’ full names.

### PART II

An explanation of the general land cover characteristics for each watershed would be helpful. Table 1 provides an element of confusion regarding the proportion of forested land that needs to be acknowledged.

Needs a conclusion section that summarizes the study, discusses implications, and acknowledges limitations and future research directions.

**Line 817:** add comma after part

**Line 832:** removed comma after intensity and response

**Line 841:** add “the” after “we consider”

**Line 848:** change patchlevel to “the patch level”

**Line 855 & 883:** change “land-cover” to land “cover” (and throughout paper)

**Line 868:** change “Fig.” to “Figure” (and throughout paper); “provides” to “provide”; and remove “are”

**Line 886:** change “land-use” to “land use” (and throughout paper)

**Line 937:** unsure what dace is supposed to mean

**Line 945:** add “the” before “measuring”

**Line 987:** no supplementary information given...

**Table 1:** What is the differentiation between “forest” within land cover type and “natural forest” at the bottom of the table? For Bialo and Mae Chaem they are equal, but are different for the other two. An explanation for this must be given as the proportion of forested land is one of the primary drivers behind flow predictability.

**Figure 1:** blurry

**Figure 5:** Why are the water balance percentages different for the NatFor scenario when Figure App2 shows that the NatFor scenario is 100% for all watersheds?

**Appendix 2:** no proportions for Mae Chaem AgFor are given.