

Using a dynamic hydrologic model with varying parameters with the recovery of a burned watershed in California and radar rainfall estimates, the authors investigated changes in rainfall intensity-duration thresholds inducing flash floods in the watershed as it recovers from fire. The study is of practical value for informing post-fired flash floods. My comments are as follows.

1. The title does not accurately summarize what has been done in the study as there is little information about how the spatiotemporal distributions of rainfall affect the intensity-duration thresholds inducing flash floods or their changes with recovery.
2. Given the small sample of rainfall events (34 in total), should sampling uncertainty (thus robustness) of the estimated intensity-duration thresholds be evaluated. One simple method might be to bootstrap these events or values of $I(D, j)$, with which to obtain a set of plausible estimates of intensity-duration thresholds and evaluate robustness of the reported results.
3. There are several prescribed quantities, such as a value of 15mm/h for extracting moderate-to-high rainfall events and a value of $2\text{m}^3/\text{s}$ for defining effective discharge. I did not see discussions about the rationale of these choices, nor their potential influences on the identified intensity-duration thresholds inducing flash floods.
4. The whole third paragraph on page 6 is spent on describing the dominating spatial patterns of rainfall events in the study watershed. Nevertheless, they seem to be forgotten after that. How these spatial patterns affect the identified intensity-duration thresholds and their changes? See my first comment.
5. Lines 174-176, given such many ignored factors that may influence the reliability of derived radar rainfall estimates, how “the realistic spatial and temporal patterns of rainfall” can be guaranteed?
6. Line 179, as the used Z-R relationships are not calibrated for the study watershed, the derived rainfall events are not “realistic storms”. Replace “realistic” with “plausible”.
7. Page 8, a more concrete interpretation to $I(D, j)$ can substantially improve readability. Possibly, adding somewhere “ $I(D, j)$ indicates that $100(1-j)\%$ of the watershed experiences rainfall of duration D with intensity of I or larger.”
8. Line 383, the statement is not convincing.
9. Lines 394-397, inaccurate statements. Are all existing rainfall generators unable to produce physically realistic rainfall fields? I think this question has been addressed in many published studies.