Author's response to Editor review

Mathias Seibert

October 3, 2016

Dear editor,

we would like to thank you very much for your comments on our manuscript. Please see below our reply to the two comments:

1. On the discussion of the influence of major dams, as well as the finding that the forecasting skill of the smaller catchments is better than the larger I find their response weak. A suggestion has also been added on the reliability of the rating curves due to changes in the cross section. While I agree this is the case, I think it is somewhat suggestive. The rating curve at for example Chokwé is indeed susceptible to change due to changing cross section, but I think this applies primarily for higher flow conditions. It is not clear on what data/information they base that suggestion.

   - We understand the question is referring to the sentence in lines 14 and 15 on page 25 which is part of a paragraph discussion the sources of forecast uncertainty in this study. With the sentence we like to make the reader aware of the uncertainty in streamflow measurements in general. We strongly agree with the reviewer, that changes of river cross sections can have a strong effect on high flows. In some places also low flows can also be very uncertain. Unfortunately, due to the unavailability of data, we cannot give any information regarding to the changes of river cross sections in the stations regarded in this study. In order to clarify, that here, we are not referring to individual dams but discussing the sources of uncertainty we would like to rephrase the sentence "Furthermore, there is always a high uncertainty in streamflow measurement, which rely on repeatedly updated river cross sections" to "Furthermore, streamflow observation in general is subject to high uncertainty.".

2. Some of the changes made require revision in terms of language. Some of the new sentences are confusing. In one case on page 16 the authors added a discussion on ERSST and OISST. In subsequent sentences the preferred choice is indicated, but that choice does differ per sentence. That is somewhat confusing.

   - The sentence was added to explain the difference of ERSST and OISST in condensed way and the respective result of the predictor selection. In order to better convey the defference of the data sets on the one hand and the results of the predictor selection on the other hand, the sentences are changed to: "ERSST would be the recommended data set for time series modelling due to its greater length of

record. On the other hand, the OISST data set is a shorter data set with higher quality achieved by the inclusion of new and improved types of SST observations such as satellite imagery. However, the results show that the ERSST ENSO indices are selected more often than the OISST ENSO indices."

The authors would like to express their appreciation for the received comments. Thank you very much.