

## **Editorial Comment:**

The authors have done a good job revising the manuscript. Only a few minor pending points remain unsolved and I will check their amendment with no further need of review.

5

*Response: We really appreciate Editor Andrea Castelletti for handling our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript and prepared the response to reviewer's comments in the following.*

## **Anonymous Referee #1 (Report #2) comments:**

I reviewed this manuscript during the first round and I see that the authors have addressed all comments brought up by both reviewers. Well done. No major technical issue remain, just a few minor suggestions:

1. L 323: Remove "the" in "construction of dams in the recent decades"

10

*Response: We have removed "the" in line 323, page 14.*

2. L 339: "Retention reservoir" sounds a bit redundant, plus we know that the TSL is not a reservoir in the way is generally discussed in this paper. I suggest changing here and through the paper to "natural retention effect".

*Response: We agree with the referee and have removed "reservoir" in line 339, page 14.*

15

3. L 341: Fix the text in "between 11 and 12, 16". Perhaps better "between 11 and 12/16"?

*Response: Thank you for the suggestion. We have changed the text to "between 11 and 12 (or 16)" for more clarity in line 341, page 14.*

4. L 469: Same as in L 323.

20

*Response: We have modified the text from "retention reservoir effect" to "natural retention effect" in lines 469-470, page 20.*

5. The Ziv et al 2012 reference is duplicated.

*Response: Thank you for your thorough reading. We have removed the duplicated reference.*