


We have made all of the editor's suggested changes.

In addition, while preparing our files for archival and reproduction, we noticed a numerical error in Figure 4. The original Figure 4 is at left, and the corrected version is at right. In the corrected version, we see the basic results still hold: three of the models vastly overpredict runoff without routing. However, the corrected version shows that the total mass passing the watershed is even closer to observed than previously reported.

This discrepancy arose from initially counting the total volume of the SMB models throughout the entire time domain rather than limiting to just the 72hour validation period. The ratio of instantaneous to routed runoff is identical and unaffected, and no other results are affected- this was purely an error of visualization that has been corrected as part of our cross check before final publication file uploads. All text pertaining to Figure 4 has been updated accordingly. The only sentences that need be changed are as follows

L367 Despite indicating that reduced input runoff is required to route flows accurately across all models, overall routed cumulative discharge was lower than in situ measurements for this time period for coarse networks due to underprediction of low flows, and overpredicted using fine networks (Figure 4).

Fig 4 caption- Calibrated models underpredict water export due to underestimation of night-time low flows for coarse networks, and overpredict total water export with fine networks.



We have cross checked all other results and find no errors, and see this as a strength of the archival process, even if we are embarrassed.