Review
Impact of Spatial Distribution Information of Rainfall in Runoff Simulation Using Deep-Learning Methods
Author(s): Yang Wang and Hassan A. Karimi
Submitted to HESS

2nd review

Review date: 24 Feb 2022

The authors have done a good job in updating the manuscript. I still have one suggestion and some comments

1. Please zoom in one (or two) pick flow and present the variation of simulated and observed flows along with the rainfall used in the simulation. Please choose a long look back window. It will be useful to see if there are any lags or not (which cannot be seen clearly in Fig 7). It is important to show that the model(s) built is sensitive to rainfall and does not suffer from the influence of long look back window(s).
2. OTHER COMMENTS
   Please read and edit carefully the manuscript as some of the figures and tables are not numbered correctly. Some suggestions are:
   a. Abstract: "regional" instead of region models
   b. Line 168: Unclear and please rephrase it: "Since the values in this vector represent rainfall information at different locations in the catchment, our assumption is that the vector is rainfall data with spatial distribution information."
   c. Line 206: Clarify Snow-17 models
   d. Line 289: "… 70% of the data are used for model training, 20% for model validation, and 10% for model testing." I think validation and testing are used synonymously. Perhaps you want to use the term cross-validation instead of validation. If it is so then the correct sentence should be: "… 70% of the data are used for model training, 20% for model testing, and 10% for model cross-validation."
   e. Line 294: " ... catchment 1-5 are combined to train regional 295 model 1, and training data from catchment 6-10 are combined to train regional model 2." Fig 1 does not show catchment numbers. Or have I missed where you have shown the numbers of the catchments?
   f. Line 304:"is" to was
   g. Line 303: Table 1 should be Table 2
   h. Table 2: Define D