

Reply to RC1

Tim Hans Martin van Emmerik, Tim Willem Janssen, Tianlong Jia, Thank-Khiet L. Bui, Riccardo Taormina, Hong-Q. Nguyen, and Louise Jeanne Schreyers

Reviewer comments

The article is well-written; no major issues were found during my review. Below is a list of a few minor issues and technical corrections the authors should address before publication.

Thank you for your positive and constructive feedback. Please find our response in bold.

1. Page 4, caption of Fig. 1: there is a mismatch between what is said in the caption and what is reported in Panel A, i.e.: “The triangles indicate the camera locations, and the crosses the UAV locations”, on the map instead I think that circles indicate “camera locations” while triangles indicate “UAV locations”, right? Please correct.

We will correct this.

2. Line 162: the word “being” is repeated twice. Please remove.

We will correct this.

3. Line 204: this should be “Kruskal–Wallis” right?

Correct, this should be Kruskal-Wallis.

4. Line 259: ...or that water hyacinths could get stuck and trapped on riverbanks upstream and stop flowing downstream? Is this another option that would explain this observation right? In other words, a large fraction is trapped before and this would explain why fewer plants are detected downstream right? However in this case, also the plastic would be trapped in river banks right? Can the authors briefly discuss and elaborate on these points?

Thanks for the suggestion. We will include this in the revised manuscript.

5. Line 306: “pattern”

We will correct this.