

Editor comments: dear authors,

if you cannot add the application with more growing seasons with the same crop, a clarification of the limitations of your approach for the static benchmark in the text is sufficient, but such clarification is not clear from your reply.

The lines you cite:

"we have added the explanation in the section 2.6 line 113-115."

"we have added this explanation in the introduction from line 103 to 114."

do not match with the final version with no track-changes and the track-change version is not readable due to the many colors...

Please report the full text of the new phrases you have added in the reply letter and send a track-change version including only this last round of modification in respect to the version we had already revised.

Note the line are according to all mark up track

Response: We are sorry that the lines to our response could not match, we forgot to change after the paper came back that we needed to redo the figures in the manuscript.

From our previous response "the static model used the one crop that is represented in the dynamic then the farm is left bare, we have added the explanation in the section 2.6 line 236-237. It is true that this is not a real representation of agricultural management in the catchment, but it is how most modelers in African catchment simulate SWAT model, we have added this explanation in the introduction from line 84 to 87. This was the one of the objectives of this paper to show that better representation of cropping seasons is needed, and we showed the effect of implementing seasonal dynamic".