

List of Changes

1. Line 25 of Page 2: Replaced "while" with "and" for grammatical accuracy, in response to Comment 1.
2. Lines 208, 219, 223, 248, 249, 256–258, 274, 327, 331, 493, 497–499, 502, 507: Removed the unit notation “m³/m³” for SWC, in response to Comment 2.
3. Line 305 of Page 15: Revised “0.7–2.4 d” to “from 0.7 d to 2.4 d” and “0.2–3.6 d” to “from 0.2 d to 3.6 d” for improved readability, in response to Comment 3.

Note: The above changes are indicated using track changes in the marked-up revised manuscript.

Response to Editors' Comments

Dear Editor,

We sincerely appreciate your valuable comments and suggestions on our manuscript. In response, we have carefully reviewed your feedback and made the necessary revisions. Below, we provide a detailed point-by-point summary of the corrections made:

Comment 1:

Line 25. Correct grammar.

Response 1:

Thank you for your valuable feedback. To enhance clarity and grammatical precision, we have replaced "while" with "and" to more accurately reflect the relationship between delayed stormflow initiation and GWL fluctuations. The revised sentence is:

Delayed stormflow is initiated when SWC exceeds the soil's water storage capacity, and its timing and magnitude are further modulated by GWL fluctuations." (Page 2, Line 25)

Comment 2:

Lines 208, 219, 223, 248, 249, 256 to 258, 274, 327, 493, 497 to 499, 501, 507. SWC is dimensionless, it is useless to specify "m³/m³".

Response 2:

Thank you for your comment on the unit notation for SWC. While SWC is typically expressed as a dimensionless volume fraction, we initially used "m³/m³" for clarity. To align with standard hydrological conventions and avoid redundancy, we have removed the unit where unnecessary and revised the manuscript accordingly. (Lines 208, 219, 223, 248, 249, 256 to 258, 274, 327, 331, 493, 497 to 499, 502, 507)

Comment 3:

Line 326. Substitute "0.7–2.4 d" and "0.2–3.6 d" with "from 0.7 d to 2.4 d" and "from 0.2 d to 3.6 d", respectively.

Response 3:

We appreciate your suggestion to improve clarity by explicitly stating the range of lag times. We have revised the text accordingly, changing "0.7–2.4 d" to "from 0.7 d to 2.4 d" and "0.2–3.6 d" to "from 0.2 d to 3.6 d". Thank you for your valuable input. (Page 15, Line 305)

The authors sincerely appreciate the editor's valuable feedback. We have carefully revised the manuscript to enhance its clarity and rigor. The updated version has been submitted, and we look forward to your thoughtful evaluation.

Yours
Zhen Cui, Fuqiang Tian
March 9, 2025