

Review of the manuscript "A Framework for Advancing Streamflow and Water Allocation Forecasts in the Elqui Valley, Chile", by Delorit *et al.*

The manuscript discusses an approach to provide actionable seasonal climate information about precipitation and streamflow for the Elqui Valley, in Chile. The results are robust, and they will be of use for both the scientific and the climate service communities. I recommend to publish it in HESS after the authors have addresses several (minor) issues.

Specific Comments

P1,L8-16: The abstract should clearly include concrete results. The paper is far more interesting than what the abstract suggests. For example, a mention of the way the models are used in sequential mode, or the skill achieved, can be mentioned there.

P1L20: "institutions"

P4,L13,L16: something is wrong with the way the references are being written. E.g., it should be Aceituno, 1988.

P7, Section 2.1: Is the data quality-controlled? Maybe add a sentence or two about that, so the reader knows if the data can be trusted.

P7,L17,L21 (and other places): vector winds? This is the first time I see that name. What the authors mean by that? To use both u and v? Why do not just say "winds"?

P8L8: why to do a spatial average? I do not fully understand that sentence.

P9L1: are the authors talking about CFSR? They are talking about NCEP-NCAR reanalysis but then they cite Saha et al 2013. Is there a confusion here?

P10: define N.

P11L21: why a forecast is not issued in that case? Explain in the text.

P11Section2.2: I suggest to change the title of the subsection, as it seems to be about a proper dynamical prediction model, and it is really about using dynamical model output in a statistical model.

P11L28: I think the authors mean "North American Multi-Model Ensemble".

P12L8: authors should be a bit more explicit about when local variables have predictive strength. Conditions? Dates? Proportion of total cases? More information is needed.

P14L1-2: please check the syntax of the sentence.

P14, eqs 3 and 4: how are these equations obtained?

P14Section2.4: I suggest to remind the reader that all these results are obtained using cross-validation (a lot of studies out there do not even bother to cross-validate!)

P14L9: why Pearson coefficient?

P14L10: ...as opposed to *a specific quantity*....

P16L2: references in capital

P16L22-24: confusing sentence... too many commas?

P17L11: maybe change “affirming” → “confirming”?

P19L20: approach or model? Which one?

P19L20-21: I do not understand the sentence. When the other 40% occur?

P20Step2a and Step2b: what is the real difference here?

P25L25: 92% is extremely high. Can you please confirm there is not a typo there?