

The research shows how state-of-the-art technology can be applied to estimate river flow at a small spatial scale. The authors took into consideration the comments made previously and significantly improved the contribution. The methods and results were clearly explained. I consider that this research has substantial scientific merits for its acceptance. The manuscript requires minor corrections specially in formatting, see below for my comments.

L38 – I do not think that your study has applied low-cost technology to river monitoring. In-situ monitoring is cheaper. However, I understand that compared to other systems (for example, a plane with Lidar), yours is more economic. I think it would be good to clarify this in the sentence. Same in L361)

L40 – Here you talk about the validation process, but it is not very clear what it includes. It is worth adding a sentence explaining the methods (e.g., how calibration and validation were done).

L41- While the specific objectives are important to understanding the research, I do not think it is worth mentioning them in the abstract. It would be better to mention your overall aim. This will also give space to include the methods to understand the summary of the results.

L107 – Please provide a summary of the method of Samboko et al. (2022) and then use the reference. If this is related to L110 please make it clear. Although it looks like L110 is related to Alvarez (2018).

L136 – Use of a single set of parentheses “(D3DFM, Deltares, 2020)”.

L157 – I don't see the point of using a subsection (also make it as "2.4.1" if you are including it).

L160 – Same comment on Samboko et al. 2022. Include a summary here or above (L107).

L214 – Removed the extra dot before referring to Moriasi et al. (1983)

L219 – This sentence should not be in bold.

L220 – Tabulation. Maybe this is related to document conversion, please check final draft of the PDF before submitting.

L217 – Tabulation errors (same as previous comment).

L266 – Superscript error “-/13”. Also use for the Manning coefficient either “ $m^{-1/3}$ ” or “ $s/[m^{1/3}]$ ”.

L266 – Table 2 shows the opposite, that means CM: 15.4% & LSPIV: 8.1%. Please check.

L267 – I recommend using the same unit (do not convert) as in the table (i.e., 0.193 m instead of 19.3 cm). It makes it easy to quickly identify the value in the table.

L272 – Change to “, with the lowest values of LSPIV (6.4%) and water levels (0.063 m) for 0.015  $s/[m^{1/3}]$  and 0.014  $s/[m^{1/3}]$ , respectively”.

LL273 – Don't highlight the row in the table, use a subscript (eg \*) and add a sentence below the table like “\* the selected optimal roughness coefficient”.

L275 – I think the validation by visual analysis is not as robust as a quantitative method. However, you can justify and discuss the reasons the selected method. This is important.

L281 - I don't see a discussion of the calibration and validation processes. He mentioned in the summary that there is a need for more on-site monitoring in the future, but why is not covered in this section. It is important to do it.

L402 – The discussion must be before the conclusion section. Also, if you are adding a discussion section, remove “discussion” it from section 3 (3 Results and Discussion, L243).

Figure 8 – Missing a parenthesis.

In general, italics are used to reference figures and tables. I don't recall this being part of the journal's formatting and editing requirements. Remove the italics. Also, the table formats are not consistent (.eg., Table 1 vs Table 2). Sections and subsections do not follow the same format, some of them are case sensitive sentences, others are not (e.g., 3.1 vs 3.2) the same goes for figures and tables (L273 vs L296).