

This data publication describes the Rosalia experimental watershed, and introduces the data that is collected between 2015 and 2019. The manuscript is a revised version, and has greatly improved from its first submission. The authors added background information about the watershed such as soil and vegetation information, and were much more explicit about data cleaning processes, which will be crucial for future users of the data. I appreciate the additional figures and improvements on the figures, which are much more informative and readable now.

Although the article has clearly improved I still found that sometimes the text was longer than it needed to be. One reason for that could be that some topics (e.g., rain gauges and rainfall sampling) are discussed in different paragraphs. Hence, the reader had to be reminded of the rain gauge set-up to make the paragraph understandable. Re-structuring the article a bit more such that all relevant information is mentioned together will further reduce the length of the article and improve its readability. It will also reduce questions such as “how is precipitation sampling protected against fractionation” that arose as I first read about the rain gauges.

I found the summary rather confusing. It starts with “The data represent an effort..”, but which data, “The data presented in this manuscript ..” ? being more specific would be helpful here. “The record for some components started in 2015” also doesn’t say much. When did it start for other components? And for which components did it start in 2015? Again, making sentences more specific will increase the readability and avoid frustration with the reader (e.g., “The first monitoring stations for precipitation, discharge and weather variables were installed in 2015, and xx additional nested catchments have been added since then.”). Then, the summary goes on to explain why it’s important to publish data and then it moves back to a sentence about the measurements (data cleaning), showing that also here the information is scattered rather than presented in one location. I suggest rewriting the summary such that topics are described together and such that it reflects the content of the paper is needed.

Minor comments:

L35: CZO, update with more recent CZN

L56: giving examples of these questions would be more meaningful

Fig.1: Why are climate stations (K1 and K2) and soil moisture stations located at the same elevation, rather than covering a range in elevation?

L77: examples of these parameters?

L105: “water holding capacity” rather than wind capacity? And please be specific about how wind and slope affect organic content. “wind” doesn’t do much to organic content, but wind erosion might. Slope doesn’t do much to the organic content, either, but gravitational transport does.

L09 onwards: maybe a more descriptive name than category 2 is possible, and would make it easier for the reader to follow.

Fig. 3: use other numbers to indicate category’s – currently confusing with percentages.

L142: spectrometer probe, mention brand or refer to table

Table 2: not sure if the websites here are needed...

L169: (how) are the autosamplers equipped to avoid fractionation?

L203: maybe include the ‘rules for proper placement’ or at least the rules that were violated (in addition to the one that is mentioned particularly).

L205: how are these rain gauges equipped to avoid fractionation?

L217: refer to figure 1?

L227: how are these samples protected from fractionation when left without maintenance for 24 days, particularly when freezing issues occur (L227-230).

L231: please explain more carefully. The grab sample was analyzed directly or kept in a closed bottle until the autosampler sample was analyzed (open for 24 days?). Please show these results here or in the supplementary material, or at least mention an r^2 value or any other type of statistics.

Sections rain gauges and water quality: please merge these sections such that all relevant information is presented together. In the current version, the sites and type of rain gauge are repeated, and reading the initial rain gauge section raises questions about sampling is done.

L267: was a time-window (smoothing window) applied for the linear interpolation? If so, please mention the time-window.

L269 and L273: please define 'very low flow'

L285: increased compared to what?

L304: please merge with other paragraph describing this problem.

L305: good agreement of what? The timing? Or the precipitation magnitude? Why would precipitation magnitude be similar at two different stations?