

Author comments and responses to second round of peer-review.

Anonymous referee #1

No comments or suggestions for revisions.

Anonymous referee #2

1. Title is adjusted, much better now.

2. Data URL in the abstract is still valuable from my point of view, but editor has to decide.

We have added the doi of the dataset and the doi of the accompanying watershed delineations to the abstract in the following manner:

L23: Replaced “Links to the complete dataset, watershed delineations with metrics, and calculation scripts can be found in Sect. 6 and 7.” with “The complete hourly and five-minute interval datasets can be accessed at <https://doi.org/10.21966/J99C-9C14> (Korver et al., 2021) and accompanying watershed delineations with metrics can be found at <https://doi.org/10.21966/1.15311> (Gonzalez Arriola et al., 2015).”

3. statement about climate change analysis with this (rather short) dataset is now much clearer

4. L195-196: I can understand why the sensors at one station are around 2 meters higher compared to the other stations. However, this must be mentioned very clearly in the manuscript and the meta data as long the effect is not evaluated in the paper.

We agree and we have further specified this in the text by adding the following sentence:

*L238: “This adjustment includes a station height variable, thus accounting for potential effects of the elevated total precipitation gauges at ‘East Buxton’ and ‘Reference Station’ and rain gauge orifice at ‘East Buxton’ (i.e. 4 m instead of 2 m).”*

This is in addition to mentioning the station height differences in L157-L159 and in the metadata README document provided with the data package.

5. data update with high-resolution data (5min) is appreciated

6. L289: I cannot see the difference between computer-automated linear regression gap filling and manual linear regression gap filling. Please state clearly how long those gaps are.

Note that the computer automated gap-filling was only applied to gaps < 30 min and that linear interpolation (not regression) was used; gaps > 30 min used back-up sensor data (installed in proximity of the pressure transducer) that were converted to pressure transducer location-specific water levels using a relation established by linear regression. We clarified the text as follows:

*L249: replaced “while longer gaps were filled manually using linear regression of the data from the back-up stand-alone water level sensors that were installed in proximity of the main stage sensors.” with “while gaps > 30 min were filled using a relation (linear regression) between data from back-up stand-alone water level sensors and pressure transducers”*

7. minor comments have been addressed appropriately.