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General comments

The paper comparing different base flow separation methods is of great interest to the community and in the scope of the journal. The paper is generally well structured (apart from some confusion between results and discussion). The science is sound and exciting. Some revision on the English is necessary to improve the paper – please check grammar and phrasing - some comments are made in the following. The abstract is generally well written and sparks interest. Suggestions for some minor changes are included below. A table would help to better highlight the differences between alternative methods presented on page 3486. I would generally suggest separating the discussion from the conclusions. This could also help to discuss the findings of...
this study in regard to their particularity for lowland areas as mentioned throughout the abstract and introduction but not really done later in the paper. Please find some specific remarks for a minor revision below.

Specific remarks
3484/4 – Sentence starting with: “Moreover. . .” Not necessary
3484/16 – GW-flooding?
3484/18 – determined?
3484/23 – better reformulate “separate” – may be “identify”?  
3484/28 – Resulted in good results – please reformulate
3485/3 – Change to: “Understanding runoff generation processes. . .”
3485/21 – Please rephrase sentence beginning with: “That is why. . .”
3486/5 – Sentence needs rephrasing
3486/22 – Please describe under which conditions this applies
3487/10 – somewhat more sophisticated calculation methods – please specify – this is to imprecise
3487/17 – paper objectives are rather unspecific – please explain in more detail – especially the relation to lowland areas
3489/7 – sentence needs rephrasing – English in rest of sub-section requires improvement
3490/23 – at what intervals?
3491/12 – again – at what intervals?
3492/10 – How valid is this assumption?
3496/20 – can this be quantified?
3497/2 – please rephrase – confusing sentence
3497/4 – Is this a result or an assumption?
3498/14 – Any data to back this up?
3501/5 – Last paragraph belongs into discussion!

Figures & tables:
Fig1: Please increase symbol size for weirs and inlets
Fig2: Boreholes and their depth hard to identify
Fig3: Please explain abbreviations as OWS etc
Fig4: What does mm/4-h mean?
Fig5: Hard to differentiate between Ca and Mg tracers
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