

The authors have taken on the comments and suggestions made in the first review concerning the reformulation of objectives and the definition of end-user input. The supplements are interesting and useful.

In my opinion, the manuscript is acceptable in this 2nd version.

Just one last comment:

The residue study in supplement 1 is a good idea. Trends are presented basin by basin (which is interesting). But these trends are only compared with the percentage increase in forest area over the entire study area. It would have been more convincing to show the variation in forest area (and/or urbanized area) in each basin beside the residual trends.