

Review of the manuscript "Quantify Oceanic Moisture Contribution to the Tibetan Plateau " by Ying Li et al.

Despite the moisture sources of the Tibetan Plateau (TP) have been basically revealed by several researches on the basis of different methods, the further study of the moisture sources over TP from various dataset is necessary. In this manuscript, the authors quantified the absolute and relative contributions of oceanic moisture sources over TP based on a moisture tracking model and the various atmospheric reanalysis products. The methods in the manuscript is generally effective, while the moisture tracking method in this study still have non-ignorable uncertainties and need proper evaluation. In science, the novel contribution of this study is not clear due to most of the conclusions have been revealed in previous studies. Therefore, I would recommend that the manuscript need major revision before accepted by HESS. Below are my specific comments.

Specific comments:

1. In this study, there are several approximation in the Eulerian moisture tracking method (Van der Ent et al., 2010; Van der Ent, 2014), which induce non-ignorable uncertainties of the moisture sources calculations. For example, it only can resolve two vertical layers in the model and does not consider all the water substances (water vapour, cloud droplets, cloud ice, rain, and snow) and all the physical processes that the moisture undergo in the model, eg. deep convection, shallow convection, cloud macrophysics, cloud microphysics, diffusion etc. It is not the best one. In fact, the detailed quantified moisture models have been developed. In the references in around line 70, I suggest the authors pertinently evaluate previous studies and properly evaluate Van der Ent' (2014) method in section 2.1. Also need indicate the uncertainties of this method in the manuscript.
2. In science, the novel contribution of this study is not clear. The absolute and relative contributions of moisture sources, including oceanic source over TP have been quantitatively revealed. I suggest the authors focus on the comparisons of moisture sources evaluation based on the various atmospheric reanalysis products. The relationship between model oceanic source and isotope $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ is interesting.
3. In line 147, I do not think the oceanic sources of the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and the Persian Gulf, can compared to the Atlantic. They are too small. If say this, please give the quantitative tracking results.
4. Please indicate the sub-figures when describe in around line 239.