

This paper provides a valuable quantitative assessment of the impact of input data temporal resolution on hydrological modeling, offering significant insights for researchers and practitioners in this field. The study is both academically and practically relevant.

The authors conducted extensive watershed modeling and designed two experiments based on common forecasting tasks, using multiple evaluation metrics, which enhances the reliability of the conclusions. The paper successfully links its findings to existing literature, addressing a gap where similar conclusions required validation in different regions. By confirming these findings in a new area, the authors strengthen the reliability and generalizability of the conclusions, contributing valuable insights to the existing body of knowledge.

Overall, this paper is well-designed, content-rich, and makes a meaningful contribution to hydrological modeling. I recommend it for acceptance after revisions.

Although this paper is overall well-done, I believe the following points require further clarification and revision to help improve the paper's overall quality.

1. In addition to the rainfall and runoff data already mentioned in the paper, other data used for modeling should also be detailed.
2. It would be beneficial to reference Figure 2 at the beginning of Section 2.3 when introducing the experimental design. This will help readers refer to the flowchart while reading the corresponding text, improving their understanding of the experimental setup.
3. In the hourly tests, the model's original output was at the hourly scale, while the calibration was conducted at different time scales, and then the evaluation metrics were calculated back at the hourly scale. Why? I believe it is necessary to provide further clarification on the rationale behind this design choice.
4. In the results shown in Figure 3, the REP values are negative for most watersheds in both the daily and hourly tests. Does this mean there is a systematic underestimation of peak values in the model?
5. The paper currently concludes that higher resolution data does not necessarily improve prediction accuracy. It would strengthen the paper to include further analysis or discussion from a hydrological mechanism perspective to explore the underlying reasons for this finding.