Reviewer 2 report - hess-2020-639

General comments:

The reviewer appreciates the work made by the authors to improve the manuscript, this includes additional framing of the results and the work as a case study of value, with much improved justification of the choice and discussion of the limitations. The additional results tables provide much needed clarity to the results. My only general comment would be to urge the authors to limit their use of long paragraphs where important ideas can get lost to the reader (two examples of this are included in the specific comments). Some minor comments follow.

Specific comments:

L 19-20: To which adjustment do you refer here?

Table 3: P_5 is NAN in all seasons, why? Should it remain in the table?

L 405: Consider separating table 3 and table 4 results into two paragraphs.

Figure 1: Panel f is missing.

L 437: Why can't these percentiles be plotted, is it by choice? If this is the case, a reference in the text justifying the decision to limit the figure's range would be useful.

Figure 6 caption: R^2D^2 tag is missing next to (f).

L 528: It could be worth discussing that there is a seasonal component to the effect of ETP, could winter biases be more relevant for flood modelling than summer biases in ETP?

Table 8: mQDM, Winter, Cal: value is 1%, should this be 100%?

L 627-660: This is a very long paragraph which can be split to ease reading (e.g., along sentences starting with First, Second, Third…).

L 648: Related to the above, the sentence starting here is important and should be highlighted as an important result (perhaps by starting a new paragraph?)