We would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their handling of and comments on the manuscript. Two versions are submitted. One that shows the difference between the original and the first revision, while the second one is the revised version (as a supplement).

Specifically, the problem of how smaller observation gauge density is likely to lead to underestimation of peaks is added to the introduction (see Sect. 1). It was taken out of another section and expanded. Next, it is shown that the observation gauge distribution in the study area is uniform for all elevations in the study area, because it was pointed out by Prof. Beven that the likely cause of volume error is due to less gauges in the higher elevations (see Sect. 3). Details of how the inverted precipitation was calculated were also unclear. More details are added (see Sect. 3.2). The anonymous reviewer pointed out that the roll of temperature and PET on peaks should be clarified. It is also added (see Sect 3.4). Prof. Beven also asked for any possible solutions that may help to get rid of the bias due to interpolation. For that, preliminary approaches are now added (see Sect. 6). The anonymous reviewer asked to rearrange the conclusions according to the result and also make it clear that results are due to models and not actual observations. These are also rearranged and added respectively (see Sect. 7).

We hope that the revised version is to the satisfaction of the editor and the reviewers.

Thanks.