

Line	Comment
10-11	<p><i>“where the major plant growth controlling factor is the rainfall (via soil moisture) rather than temperature.”</i> – it seems as if you mean to say that temperature is the preferred plant growth controlling factor, maybe you can cut the sentences up into two sentences: 1) However, SWAT has limitations in simulating the seasonal growth cycles for trees and perennial vegetation in tropics. 2) In the tropics plant growth is mainly controlled by rainfall (via soil moisture), whereas in SWAT plant growth is temperature controlled.</p>
57	<p><i>“Normalized Vegetation Index (NDVI)”</i> – shouldn’t this be: “Normalized Vegetation Difference Index (NDVI)”?</p>
97	<p><i>“poorly drained soils cover the plateau”</i> I was wondering what you meant with “plateau”. I guess the Mau escarpment?</p>
192-193	<p>Does this mean that there can be set two starts of the rainfall seasons (SOS) for a bimodal rainfall regime? : So there is an end of the dry season [SOS1] and a beginning of the rainy season [SOS2] for the long rains (for the Mara for example) and there is another end of the dry season [SOS3] and a beginning of the rainy season for the short rains [SOS4] ?</p>
196	<p><i>“pentad ratio”</i> – I had never heard of this, I don’t know whether it is a common term (maybe it’s because I am a non-native speaker of English), but to make it easier to read you might also just say “ five day ratio”.</p>
302-306	<p>This trial-and-error process was it done manually or with for example SWAT-CUP? And if so, did you have some sort of a steps that you followed in this procedure?</p> <p>I am curious because personal experience taught me that altering these five LAI parameters in SWAT-CUP or directly in the input .mgt or .plant files, could give pretty random outcomes in terms of LAI curves or PET, and results of altering multiple LAI parameters at the same time are difficult to predict.</p>
308-309	<p>Do you know why Kilonzo (2014) [Penmann-Monteith] and Mwangi (2016)[Hargreaves] recommend using a minimum LAI for FRSE of respectively 3 and 4? For Mwangi this worked very well. For tropical forest in Brasil this is reasonable, but looking at the mean annual LAI in the FRSE of the Mau escarpment of 2.6 this seems too high of an estimate.</p> <p>I also saw in figure 7 That you had set the minimum LAI for SWAT-T to about 2.2 and maximum LAI to 5. Was this just for the purpose of giving an example at the same setting as the default or was this also the value as used in your simulations?</p>
334-336	<p><i>“We also notice the SWAT-T simulated potential transpiration is consistent while changing the PET method to Hargreaves method in SWAT (results not shown here).”</i></p> <p>Interesting! Is this also the case for the PET at times where LAI > 3 ? Did you also try using the Priestley-Taylor (P-T)?</p> <p>Personal modelling experience in the region taught me that the annual PET using the P-T method is often lower then when using the Hargreaves or P-M, thus giving a lower AET, thus implicating that there is more water in the catchment system to "play with" as in comparison to the P-M or Hargreaves.</p>