

Replies to reviews

“To what extent does river routing matter in hydrological modelling?”

Nicolás Cortés-Salazar, Nicolás Vásquez, Naoki Mizukami, Pablo A. Mendoza, and Ximena Vargas

We provide responses to each individual point below. For clarity, comments are given in italics, and our responses are given in plain blue text.

Editor

Thank you very much for your thoughtful revisions. Based on the assessment of one reviewer and my own reading of your manuscript, I believe that your work has strongly benefited from your additional efforts. However, as the reviewer points out, the manuscript could be further strengthened by making it more concise and developing a clearer punchline: what can and does your analysis really show? Reducing the material that does not really support your argument will help the reader to more strongly appreciate the findings of your experiment. That is not to say that all other material needs to be omitted, but it can be made available for the interested reader as supplementary material. I think these adaptations can be made in an additional round of minor revisions..

Thank you very much for your positive feedback. In response to your suggestion, we have created a Supporting Information file that contains the full results, and have made the following modifications in the manuscript:

- Figure 5: we now show results for only two metric time steps (1 h and 24 h).
- Figures 7, 9 and 10: we now show results for only three routing time steps (1 h, 3 h and 6 h).

Accordingly, we have made slight modifications to the text (L265-266, L295-296 and L345). I should be noted that none of these changes affect the main messages of this work.

Thank you again for your time and consideration. We look forward to hearing from you.

Pablo A. Mendoza and co-authors.