Generally, the authors have addressed all my comments in an adequate manner. They greatly improved the introduction, doing a great job of contrasting the paper against the nature of hybrid modelling - which, as they correctly point out, is not well defined. While I would challenge their comment that "LSTM is in some way replicating the hydrological processes, as in the Kratzert papers cited throughout" as these papers did not include any streamflow forecasts as inputs (at least to my knowledge), I would leave further debate on this and the nature of hybrid models in hydrology to the open scientific community. Also, the methods section has improved a lot, making the all steps of the experiments a lot clearer. The discussion has also been extended, now sufficiently contrasting the work against current research. However, while the conclusion summarizes the key methods and results in a precise and short manner, it ends rather abruptly without providing 2-3 sentences to put the results into the broader context as outlined in the introduction (streamflow forecasting using ML, complementing the current surge of ML in hydrological sciences, one of multiple possible applications of hybrid modelling or similar). I would suggest the authors to smoothen this out in the final manuscript.

Below, some formal or minor comments:

- l.84 are Discusse<u>S</u> above
- l. 85: is the abbreviation NWP introduced before?
- l. 89: Boucher et al - Year missing
- l. 96: "by sequentially"?
- ll. 99-101: Please revise citation formats
- Fig. 2 greatly facilitates understanding what was done, thank you for adding it. For completeness, one could differentiate between the Training/Testing and operational period here, i.e. indicating that it is either ERA5 or IFS that is used as input
- l. 349 - Training period was previously noted to be 1990-2019
- ll. 356-67: The reference to "early stopping" is not quite clear to me. How would that make models less sensitive to inital weights?
- ll. 620-623 - redundant with figure caption. For me, this does not have to be repeated here.
- ll. 620-625: While valuable information, this paragraph does not use it to place the results into broader perspective. I suggest concluding this paragraph by an extended version of l 619, quickly getting back to the broader context and contribution of this work to it.
- Table 6: Caption - Aren`t better performing gauges placed towards the right?
- References: Random find: Frame 2022 is listed twice