

*Comments to the Author:*

*Dear Authors,*

*The contents of your field observation are very interesting, and I think that the manuscript reached to the level for discussion and review process, although the results and discussions were bit too descriptive. More discussions towards the implications and generalizations of the finding from this particular research. For this, several other references might be useful. But, I would like to proceed the review process. Please consider above points when you make revisions based on the reviewer's comments in the next step.*

*Regards,*

*Nobuhito Ohte, Associate Editor*

Dear Nobuhito Ohte,

First, we would like to thank for the time you spent on our submitted MS, and for your overall positive and constructive evaluation of our submitted MS. Second, as also mentioned by both referees, we clearly realized that some parts of our submitted MS were too descriptive and suffer from poor organization and need a more thorough review of similar studies in forested catchments. Consequently, we will put important effort in improving our revised MS to address the questions of presentation, description of the state of the art, and discussion in the light of previous works. We will modify the Introduction section and profoundly rework the text of the Results and Discussion sections of our revised MS that will include 2 new figures (Fig. 7 and 8 in the revised MS) and 5 revised figures (Fig. 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 in the revised MS) (see replies for referees). We provide our replies to both referees and we will try to address all the questions and comments they raised and we are convinced that the manuscript will be improved significantly. In the following documents, we sorted all comments/questions (Comment#x) and provide for each an answer (Reply#x) and sometimes the future changes in the revised MS (Changes in the revised MS#x). However, the revised MS is not yet ready.

Best regards,

Loris Deirmendjian & Co-authors