

The authors have carefully revised the manuscript and well addressed the comments of both reviewers. This significantly improved readability and contributes to clarity of methodological approaches. I have only a few very minor suggestions below, mainly concerning typos. I think that the manuscript can be published in its current form after these minor changes have been made.

Line 127: Change point to comma. “[...] to track the moisture source (Section 2.3.4), resulting in precipitation [...]”

Line 226: suggested change: “observed and estimated  $L_vE$ ”

Line 232: “introduced **and** coefficients”. Either a word is missing or the and should be removed.

Line 241: I think there is something missing in this phrase: “[...] when the radiation decreases yields of  $L_vE$ .”

Figure 4: Suggested change to “average and standard deviation of the diurnal cycle of [...]” or “averaged diurnal cycle and standard deviation of [...]”.

Line 247-248: Does this mean that 30% of the water surface is frozen or 30% of the total water amount?

Line 326: suggested change “**A**amazon basin” (capital letters)

Line 359: suggested change “ground**w**ater input” (remove space)

Line 360: suggested change “lake **w**ater balance” instead of mass balance in accordance with change in title of the subsection.

Figure 10: The red line shows not only the evaporation trend, but also that of precipitation. Suggestion to generalize: “The long-term trend is indicated by the red line.”

Line 461: suggested change “errors **o**f ~7%”

Line 467: suggested change: “are explained **t**o 74%”

Line 480: suggest change: “**a**n interannual variability”

Line 507: “[...] are implicitly included in the site-adapted Penman equation as [...]” Missing phrase or remove “as”.

Line 528: “and \_\_\_ are empirical constants”; Symbol missing.