Response to reviewer 1

We thank the reviewer for constructive feedback and positive comments.

Response to major comments

M1: We completely agree with the reviewer; more information should be given concerning catchment features, size, and climatology. In response to this comment, we will include new wording clarifying that the study focuses on forested, relatively steep, rainfall dominated catchments, without significant snowfall and without significant regional groundwater systems. We will also include new language and a figure demonstrating the relatively erratic nature of the flow regime in the study catchments. Such a regime is ideal for recession sensitivity analysis, as the catchments "explore" a large range of recession behaviors and wetness states.

M2: The reviewer's comment summarizes the purpose of our work.

M3: We thank the reviewer for noticing this. Snow is an unimportant feature in our catchments, which are entirely rain dominated coastal watersheds. We will make this clearer in the revised manuscript, which will include more information on the features, climatology, and flow regime of the study catchments.

Response to minor comments

m1: The reviewer is correct. However, we included this citation because *Ye et al.* (2014) extract individual, contiguous periods of recession with constraints similar to those mentioned in many event-scale analyses. This is contrasted with *Brutsaert and Nieber's* (1977) proto-typical "bulk" recession analysis method, which completely avoids the issue of extracting contiguous segments.

m2: We are grateful for the reviewer's attention to detail. We will review our citations list and fix these issues.