

**Response to the editor's comment to the manuscript: 'Use of expert elicitation to assign weights to climate and hydrological models in climate impact studies' (manuscript number hess-2021-597)**

Thank you for carefully considering the remarks and suggestions of two anonymous reviewers that provided excellent comments to your article and brought extremely important issues in the application of climate model projections for climate impact studies. I have very much enjoyed reading your responses to the reviewers. Your clarifications and insights on both reviewer's' concerns about the expert elicitation methodology you are proposing, provides a good degree of transparency on your scientific contributions, adding an extra layer of clarity in this important effort. My only comment refers to the use of the wording "assign equal probability to all climate models" or using the wording "equal probability". I understand this refer to "an equal probability for all models to reliably projecting future climate changes", but reading the statement by itself can be misleading. I would clarify this statement by adding one two sentences at beginning of the methodology about what the word "probability" means in this context of expert elicitation. You also use the word "weights" as a synonymous of probability, but this also deserves clarification.

**A section explaining the terms 'equal probability' and 'weight' was added to the methods section: 'In the context of this study equal probability means that all models have an equal probability of correctly predicting future climate change or the impacts of climate change on hydrology in case of hydrological models. While describing the results of the study, the term 'model weight' is used interchangeably with 'model probability'. (lines 221-224)**