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The paper describes an impact study on extreme hydrological variables in the Nile basin by a modeling study of 2 different sub-catchments in different climatic regions. I see interesting elements by comparing 2 different regions and by focusing on the extremes (whereas most studies look at the global water balance). But there are several issues that require major revisions. The current paper is far from acceptance, mainly because it is written very poorly (conclusions are bullets, just copied from MSc thesis?), lack of decent literature review. Please account for the following remarks: (1) The paper needs editing for the English language (2) A better literature study would identify existing studies that have been looking at extremes. Many papers are miss-

(3) 2 different models are proposed in the study, which could be interesting, but a lumped versus spatially distributed would have been much more interested. Also, the difference of the model is just reported, but is not further integrated with the other climate results. (4) How could ET values been computed by point measurements? Next sentence states they are computed using temperature values... Please clarify. (5) A very ad-hoc procedure is used for the climate change downscaling. On what basis, wet and dry days have been added? Why randomly? Does that respect the wet-after-day and wet-after-wet statistics? Why not using the many reported techniques that have been described in literature (e.g. statistical downscaling, regional climate models)? (6) P6 line 30: please describe the method is stead of referring to the paper. It can not be expected from the reader that s/he looks it up in order to understand the method. (7) 1/Q transformations could be dangerous for the very low flows that go close to 0. 50% decrease on nearly nothing is nearly nothing. (8) The conclusion section looks like it has been copied directly from a thesis and are not all supported by the text and figures.
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