

The authors have taken into account the criticisms and suggestions of both referees that resulted in improvement of the paper. I recommend the revised paper for publication as is.

Principal Criteria	Excellent (1)	Good (2)	Fair (3)	Poor (4)
Scientific Significance: Does the manuscript represent a substantial contribution to scientific progress within the scope of <i>Hydrology and Earth System Sciences</i> (substantial new concepts, ideas, methods, or data)?		+		
Scientific Quality: Are the scientific approach and applied methods valid? Are the results discussed in an appropriate and balanced way (consideration of related work, including appropriate references)?		+		
Presentation Quality: Are the scientific results and conclusions presented in a clear, concise, and well-structured way (number and quality of figures/tables, appropriate use of English language)?		+		

Alexander Gelfan
 Handling Editor