

## The First Paragraph

It appears that the author undertook a substantial revision. The authors emphasize that both individual drivers and interaction terms are important in explaining the observed changes in river peak flows.

The main problem I had with the first submission was a lack of details and general conclusions. The problem was largely addressed in the revision, but I am not quite satisfied yet.

First, the abstract ends with a sentence saying interaction terms explain up to 32%. It appears to end again without a general conclusion. What is the implication of the interaction terms explaining 32%? Did the authors want to say interaction terms must be considered in such studies or something else? Then please say explicitly. After reading the abstract, my eyebrows went up and I thought “is this the end?”

Second, there are still numerous areas that need minor changes. Hereby I list them from the beginning:

- The authors use ‘e.g.’ too often. Most of them are quite annoying and ‘for example’ should be used instead.
- P1: Words ‘our’ appear a couple of times. I recommend removing/replacing them because the meaning is vague.
- P1L33: I am not sure why the colon is used
- P2L7: “most studies hypothesized that deforestation...” I wonder whether the studies ‘hypothesized’ or actually ‘found’ that deforestation cause increased surface runoff. If they merely hypothesized, then what happened to the hypotheses?
- P2L26: “Section” and “Sect.” are used mixed in the document
- Section 2: the authors added a section about data availability at the end. Therefore, all the URLs in this section seem unnecessary (and are annoying)
- P3L1: “Koppen” has an Umlaut
- P3L4: “1 – 1.5” means one minus one point five. Should be “1-1.5”
- P3L24: “proposed by (Willems, 2009)” Please correct the citation format. There are other such cases in the document
- P4L15: the authors mix commas and semicolons in parentheses
- P5L20: “on (100 times) 20 random” I don’t understand what the authors meant to say
- P6L2: “17.85\*Sediment” I wonder why sediment is here. In addition, in this sentence, what did you mean by “the coefficient becomes  $-3.04 - 0.85*\text{Slope}$ ...”? Did you put 1 for Sediment? Then again why Sediment is left in the last term?
- P6L5: I don’t see how Figure 7 shows that the model explains 60% of the changes. Seeing the figure again, I still don’t get it.
- P7L2: I don’t understand “we do make any statements...”
- P7L12-13:  $10\%+6\%+6\% = 22\%$ . Does it mean that there is additional 10% you did not further explain?
- P7L18-19: authors say “with increasing slope,...” but Figure 12(a) shows decreasing slope from left to right. I recommend plotting the graph with increasing slope from left to right, consistent with (b) and (c).

- P8L28-29: “The model also showed that, for most of the considered case studies,…” What did you mean by the considered case studies? Are they previous studies? If so, how are they relevant here?
- P8L14-16: I don’t think these sentences are appropriate for the conclusion