

The study quantifies the potential hydrological benefit of the conversion of invaded stands to more pristine stands for forest management practices, in South Africa. The idea is scientifically novel and addresses key hydrological questions and the findings are likely to inform policy and decision making in the water sector. The paper needs great improvement before it can be published in HESS.

Comments.

Title- The title requires rephrasing I failed to understand why the authors emphasize on the “SUMMER RAINFALL ZONE OF SOUTH AFRICA”. Does this have anything to do with the spread of invasive or water use by these plants?

Abstract- general well written but I would recommend that authors include the objective of the study. As it is one has to speculate the direction of the study.

Introduction- This section is very weak and to general besides reading like a technical report. I would recommend that authors strengthen the motivation and support their argument with relevant literature. Authors should intensively interrogate literature and highlight scientific research strides that have been made as well as the gaps in knowledge that still need to be addressed. So far, this is totally missing. It is therefore very difficult for one to understand whether this is a technical report or a scientific study.

Methods – are poorly packaged and this makes it difficult for one to follow. I would, therefore, recommend that authors improve on this. The study area map is poorly drawn beside been illegible. A great improvement is required.

Results and discussion - although these sections read well they are very shallow and lack objectivity. The discussion is weak like the introduction; there is a lack of rigorous engagement of literature. Surprisingly there are too many references in the bibliography but the manuscript content does not demonstrate a thorough interrogation of literature.