Firstly, I would like to acknowledge all the work that you put in to revise the manuscript. I think that your revision of the manuscript addresses most of the previously raised comments adequately and clarifies the overall methods and outcome of the study.

(1) However, there is still a misunderstanding in the closure of the water balance in the use of the UTrack dataset, which becomes apparent in lines 155-171 of the revised manuscript. By converting the tracked volumes back into ratios and then using provincial P you are indeed making sure that there is the data-given amount of P. However, this quick-fix only makes sure that there is not too much or too little water but it does not correct the allocation of water from ET from the source cells. Therefore, stating that this fully avoids the bias in the estimation (lines 167-170) seems to me as an overstatement that can lead to misunderstandings. I urge you to correct this by changing the phrasing of the sentence (e.g. in line 168 from 'avoiding the estimation bias' to 'decreasing the estimation bias'). While this may seem like an almost indifferentiable change, it ensures that it is clearer that the bias in the trajectories is still there. Moisture tracking model, in general, still diverge significantly in their estimations, even with the exact same forcing, making it even more important that the bias in a 'single-model estimation' needs to be treated right and communicated clearly.

Very minor comment:

(2) In line 156 you mention the abbreviation 'ET' before its explanation in line 158. Also, you could consider using P as abbreviation for precipitation to stay consistent.