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Dear Authors,

First of all I want to complement you on submitting a paper on such an important and relevant issue as rainwater harvesting for small scale supplementary irrigation. This research is highly relevant for the development of Sub-Saharan Africa in particular.

As editor in chief, I regularly monitor the papers that appear in HESSD and without wanting to enter into the details of your paper, two things occur to me which I feel are important to highlight. One is about the correct use of units, the other is about a proper reference to the scientific literature.
I noticed that you express all the hydrological fluxes in mm, whereas a flux is always a depth per unit of time \([L/T]\). It is a general rule in HESS that fluxes are expressed with the dimension \([L/T]\) or \([L^3/T]\), whereas stocks are expressed as a depth \([L]\) or a volume \([L^3]\). Even if fluxes are accumulated, then they have been accumulated over a certain period of time, which needs to be reflected in the denominator. Accumulated rainfall over a year does not make it a stock. It remains a flux. Often people say: the annual rainfall is 200 mm. This may be correct in a colloquial sense, but the unit should be mm/year and not mm. It is the same mistake as one makes by saying: "my hourly speed is 40 km". Although it may be clear what people mean, the unit is wrong. Inversely if people say the daily temperature is 20 degrees Celcius, this does not mean that it is 20 °C/day. Mentioning the time frame does not imply that this same time frame is reflected in the unit. For instance, it is perfectly correct to say that the mean annual discharge of a river is 100 m³/s. In science, units should be correct. I have seen too often errors made because of a disregard of the proper units. Please use correct units in the text, the tables and the graphs (Figures 5 and 6).

Second, I noticed that you cite a lot of ‘grey’ literature. Grey literature may only be referred to if there is no alternative from the formal literature. In your case there are many references to informal literature that can be removed. In addition, I can’t help but notice that you missed a large part of the formal literature. This is not proper practice. Below I list a number of papers on the subject of rainwater harvesting in rainfed agriculture in Sub-Saharan Africa in which I was involved myself. But then there are likely to be more. I suggest you do a proper literature search and make use of these references in your final paper.
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