

---

## Reviewer 1

### Introductory Response

Dear Reviewer,

We sincerely appreciate your dedication and time spent reviewing our manuscript across both this and previous rounds of feedback. Your comments have been instrumental in enhancing the quality and clarity of our work. It is gratifying to know that our recent revisions have successfully addressed your earlier concerns.

In this round of revisions, we have meticulously ensured that each of your comments has been thoroughly considered and addressed, aligning our manuscript with the high standards expected by HESS.

With gratitude,

Corresponding Author

### Minor Issues

**Reviewer Point P 1.1** — Updating the abstract and conclusion with the additional analyses and results.

**Reply:** The abstract and conclusion sections have been comprehensively revised to incorporate the recent analyses and findings, thereby ensuring that they accurately reflect the expanded scope and insights of our research.

**Reviewer Point P 1.2** — New digital elevation model (DEM) resolution runs not added to Figure 9

**Reply:** We have duly updated Figure 9 to include the new DEM resolution runs. This modification provides a more detailed and complete representation of the results, aligning with the latest advancements in our analysis.

**Reviewer Point P 1.3** — Formatting issues - 'spillover' references and Table 3.

**Reply:** We acknowledge the formatting concerns raised. However, the issues noted, specifically the 'spillover' references and the layout of Table 3, are artifacts of the limitations within latexdiff, which is commonly used for generating difference files in LaTeX. We are confident that the final version of the manuscript, submitted for publication, is devoid of these formatting discrepancies. We kindly request the reviewer to consider this context, as finding a workaround for latexdiff's limitations would require additional effort that may not be warranted.