

#### General comments:

The authors have performed substantial revisions based on the reviewer's comments. I thank the authors for their detailed answers to my and the other reviewer's comments and suggestions. I was concerned about the paper structure, and statistical analysis of the model performance. The revised paper and point-by-point responses are satisfying. Following my questions, the authors took the effort to change and extent parts of the text. I can suggest accepting the paper also because the authors elaborated in detail on the questions of the other reviewers, which significantly has improved the paper. My specific major suggestions and the reasons I found them okay are as follows,

#### Specific comments:

1. Abstract:

As I suggested before, the abstract is rewritten in a better way clearly stating the outcomes of the proposed models.

2. Introduction:

The introduction part is also rewritten (structurally) and two new paragraphs were added to explain the study area and the last paragraph explaining the objectives and methods clearly.

3. Coupled Model (FL-SM):

I like the way the authors revisited the presentation of the models as in the new manuscript in section 2.5. The responses to my suggestions are indeed clear. A flow chart of the modeling approach is shown and R<sup>2</sup> (evaluators) are added to all the plots comparing the performance of different models. Thanks.

4. Model evaluations:

In response to my previous comment model evaluations were done using NSE (Nash-Sutcliff Efficiency), RMSE (Root mean squared error), and PBIAS (Percent bias) as a web plot. These and the new Taylor diagrams are visually appealing and suffice the reader for understanding.

5. Discussion part:

In response to my previous comment, the discussion part is restructured as a model and data limitations. The limitations of all three models and three data sets used are pointed out clearly. It is now clear.

6. English language usage:

Thanks. The new manuscript has been proofread and I don't have any major disagreement with the writing this time.

#### Technical corrections:

1. All the technical corrections were amended.

As I suggested before, this manuscript does not have major technical flaws despite the weak overall structure and complex writing style in the first submission. Since the authors revised it well based on the reviewer's comments, I suggest acceptance.

Congratulations!