

final_response_to_editor_minor_comments.txt

Dear editor,

Thanks for your positive response. We have addressed the last minor comments in the attached pdf with the following explanations:

1) Section 3.3.3 and response to A3: "These values were also used by a 200m resolution EWT model in the Amazon basin (Fan and Miguez-Macho, 2010a)." In the revised version you removed the values of the calibration factors a , b , f_{min} from the text and refer to the Appendix. But in the Appendix you give numbers for a , b and f_{min} based on experience of model calibration in North America. Please clarify!

We have changed this wording in the main text as:

"Near-surface K was assumed to be represented by the QMAP-derived near-surface K (Fig. 2). Deeper than 10 m, an exponential decrease of hydraulic conductivity over depth was assumed, similar to Eq. A1. As cell resolution of the NWT model is 200 m, the calibration constants used in this exponential decrease (a , b and f_{min} , see Appendix, Eq. A2) were set equal to an earlier developed 200 m resolution and locally calibrated EWT model in the Amazon basin (Fan and Miguez-Macho, 2010a)"

And in the Appendix, we have changed the wording to:

"The values of a , b , and f_{min} for the global 30-arc second EWT model are set to 120, 150, and 5, respectively, based on experience of calibration of the model with ground-observed data in North America (Fan et al., 2013b). No ground-observed water level data from New Zealand have been used to validate Eq. A2. For a case study in the Amazon, with a more detailed 200m resolution model, Fan and Miguez-Macho (2010a) used revised values for a , b , and f_{min} (75, 150, and 4, respectively)."

2) A reference to Fig. 10 is not set in the text.

Done. We had to put the figures in the right order so the text referred to 8 first, then 9 and then 10.

3)

We have changed the sentence: "Also, this study that improved input of (and calibration towards) hydraulic conductivity further reduces this bias." to "This study shows that improved input data of hydraulic conductivity (or calibration towards it) further reduces this bias."

Finally, our latex document is made in Overleaf. Can we submit through Overleaf, or do we have to send the original tex files? No problems whatsoever for both options, but through Overleaf might be more efficient.

Kind regards,
Rogier Westerhoff