

Supplement:

The manuscript is understandable but contains lots of mistakes with respect to language and sentence construction. Attached is a list of the most important linguistic errors. This list also contains some remarks to increase the understandability of the figures.

the word 'identical' is used at several places, but in most (all?) of these cases, I assume that the authors do not want to say that two things are really identical, this is: exactly the same, but rather that they are very much alike. In this case, the wording should be adjusted. (p. 5892 line 12; p. 5900, line 27; p. 5901, line 24, p. 5902, line 11-12; p. 5902, line 26)

Revised: The word identical is suitably replaced with the word 'alike'.

p. 5892: line 11: add 'the' between 'to' and 'dry data set'

Response: corrected

p. 5892, line 11-14: as it is written now, performances of simulators are compared with simulators; which does not make sense; sentence should be rephrased

Response: sentence is rephrased to improve clarity

p. 5892, line 15-16: 'the change in precipitation is less than 10%...': 10% of what? Of the average precipitation per year?

Response: corrected

p. 5894, line 6: 'basins' instead of 'basin'?

Response: corrected

p. 5894, line 23-24: '...parameters should be updated...' instead of '...the updated parameters should be used...'?

Response: corrected

p. 5894, line 27-9: wrong sentence construction, consider replacing with '...whether the parameters of rainfall-runoff models that are calibrated using historical data can be used to reliably predict runoff responses to climate change'

Response: corrected

p. 5895, line 10-11: in the current approach, the study does not really 'relate behavioural sets of parameters to climatic conditions' but rather 'establish different behavioural sets of parameters for different climatic conditions'. See my first remark concerning the splitting criterion.

Response: corrected

p. 5895, line 13-14: add reference of GLUE

Response: reference added in the revised manuscript

p. 5895, line 22: 'were obtained' instead of 'was obtained'

Response: corrected

p. 5896, line 16: '...has been discussed previously': some references of these 'numerous applications' should be added

Response: references are added in the revised manuscript

p. 5896 line 22-23: consider replacing '...representing periods where each data set define different climatic periods' with '...representing periods with different climatic conditions'

Response: corrected

p. 5897, line 22: 'are referred to as' instead of 'is referred as'

Response: corrected

p. 5897, line 23-24: Consider to replace 'Performance of each of these parameters.... were' with 'The performance of each of these parameter sets ... was'.

Response: corrected

p. 5897, line 24: 'sub periods other than those used during...' can be written more simply as 'sub periods not used during...'

Response: corrected

p. 5898, line 1: 'sets' instead of 'set'?

Response: corrected

p. 5898, line 2: 'the quantity of uncertainty in the hydrological modelling'. I would rather write 'degree of uncertainty' than 'quantity of ..', moreover, it should be specified what is meant with 'the hydrological modelling': is it about the uncertainty on the predicted runoff? Or on the parameter values?

Response: rephrased for clarity

p. 5898, line 7: delete 'of' at the end of this line

Response: corrected

p. 5899, line 5: 'dimensional' instead of 'dimension'

Response: corrected

p. 5899, line 6: 'calibrated for the dry...' instead of 'calibrated from dry ...'

Response: corrected

p. 5899, line 9-10: 'the change in volume error ...is higher than the NSE'. Shouldn't this be 'higher than the change in NSE'?

Response: We agree with reviewers comment. The text has been suitably corrected in the revised manuscript.

p. 5899, line 23-24: sentence is unclear

Response: corrected

p. 5900, line 9: add 'the' before 'original' and before 'modified', as well as before 'overestimation' on line 11

Response: corrected

p. 5900, line 12-15: sentence is unclear, should be rephrased

Response: suitably rephrased.

p. 5900 line 17: consider replacing 'for simulation with' with 'for simulating'

p. 5900, line 20: instead of 'spread in points', I would write something like 'differences in model performance'

Response: corrected accordingly

p. 5900, line 22; p. 5902, line 10, captions figure 5, 7 and 9: shouldn't 'seasonal' be replaced with 'monthly'

Response: corrected

p. 5901, line 1: '...transferability ... for the future ...' should be : '...transferability ... to the future ...'

Response: corrected

p. 5901, line 7-8 'performance ... are' should either be 'performance ...is' or 'performances...are'

Response: corrected

p. 5901, line 10: consider replacing 'significantly similar' with 'similar'

Response: corrected

p. 5901, line 15: 'sets' instead of 'set'

Response: corrected

p. 5901, line 21: 'summaries the results from' should be 'summarizes the results of'

Response: corrected

p. 5901 line 28-5902 line 3: sentence construction is incorrect

Response: corrected

p. 5902, line 4: add 'the' before 'control period'

Response: corrected

p. 5902, line 19-20: sentence construction is incorrect

Response: corrected

caption table 2: 'simulations' instead of 'simulation', add 'the' before 'generalized'

Response: corrected

Fig. 1: an explanation of the symbols should be added, and it is not clear what the second series of three graphs (third column of the figure) represents.

Response: corrected

Fig. 5: which model was used to make these predictions? Or is it a combination of all four models?; in caption: add 'for the' before 'Boyne'

Response: corrected

Caption Fig. 6: sentence construction is incorrect

Response: corrected

Fig. 8: vertical scale of Fig. (a) should be like the scale of the other figures. The caption does not explain the difference between a-b-c-d. Which data were used in each of these four figures?

Response: corrected

The caption of Fig. 9 refers to four subfigures (a, b, c, d), but I see only a and b.

Response: corrected