

The paper "Assessment of uncertainties in soil erosion and sediment yield estimates at ungauged basins: an application to the Garra River basin, India" by Swarnkar et al. highlights the different uncertainties in erosion and sediment yield estimations. Overall, the paper is written very well highlighting the different level of uncertainty and erosion and sediment yield assessment. The results also show the viability of this method for SE and SY estimation in the Garra River basin in India. The paper is very well written and can be published in HESS. However, I have following comments which can be incorporated before the publications:

Major comments

- Page 6: Line 20-24: How the spatial variability of rainfall is taken into account. Since the measured rainfall data is from stations, which interpolation method was adopted to spatially distribution the rainfall data for each grid.
- Section 3.4: Step by Step procedure: is not a methodological step. Probably the sentence can just continue without the section.
- 4.1.1: Figure 4(a) suggest the highest rainfall value as 666 mm whereas in the text it indicates 1000 m. please check.
- Section 5: The description indicates that uncertainty arising from input sources. In this study, such as R, LS, K and CP are not quantified. Out of 6 variables in SE equation, four are not considered. Similarly, the text indicates that model uncertainties are considered (and immediately suggest structural uncertainty could not be quantified). In my opinion, model uncertainty is structural uncertainty (they are the same thing). So it appears that the paper is unable to take into account many variables of uncertainty assessment. In such circumstances, I don't see a good justification for the title of the paper which highlights uncertainty estimations.
- The second paragraph of section 5 Limitation is explaining very generic limitation of data and linked to uncertainty. This needs revision and I suggest not to highlight this kind of uncertainty which is there any way (such as DEM and RUSLE equations).
- In concluding remarks: various points describing findings be avoided and major conclusions can be highlighted.

Minor comments

- Abstract: page 1, Line 22: "Furthermore, the topographic steepness (LS) and crop practice (CP) factors exhibit higher uncertainties than other RUSLE factors." However, In the main text, R, LS, K and CP are not quantified for uncertainty analysis. Please check the consistency
- Page 2: Line 5-6: the 'uncertainties' is mentioned in two places, latter can be removed. (..... These uncertainties can stem from uncertainties in data)
- Please add some references for sources of uncertainty. For example, in hydrological modelling application, uncertainties are from 1) model input data 2) structural uncertainty 3) parameter uncertainty

- Page 5: Line 4: sentence not clear "role of uncertainties in input parameters on uncertainties in the estimates"
- Page 5: Line 1 indicated river as ungauged, but Line 24 suggest one gauging station. Please clarify!
- Page 6, Line 8: SE is estimated by Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE).....The abbreviation should be used the first time when it is mentioned. RUSLE has been mentioned many time in above sections. Same applies to others also.
- Page 6: 25. It would be useful to define the SDR with proper reference. Example: SDR is defined as the sediment yield from a catchment area divided by gross erosion of the same area.
- Figure 4a: check the legend
- Figure 7 appears before Figure 5 in the text
- Page 19: Line 8 : inconsistency in references