

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

Thank you for the thorough 2<sup>nd</sup> review of the revised version of our manuscript. We are happy and grateful for the positive feedback on the manuscript and the decision to accept the manuscript after minor revisions.

All suggestions and comments provided by the Reviewers 1 & 2 have been addressed accordingly and are indicated in the track-changes version of the manuscript.

We hope our revised paper can now be considered for publication in HESS.

With kind regards,

Lea Dedden and Markus Weiler

## **Report #1**

*At the proof corrections, please check line 403. The end parenthesis is missing.*

Yes, was changed

## **Report #2**

*Figure 2 (Study design): In the figure legend, the device is referred to as an “infiltration sampler.” please ensure consistency and explicitly state the device name as used in the manuscript means a slight revision of the figure.*

Yes, was changed

*Line 31: I suggest starting the sentence with “below-canopy precipitation” to improve clarity. In its current form, the phrasing imply that stemflow is a component of throughfall, which is misleading, and considering to separate a new paragraph in the following sentences should begin here to improve readability.*

Paragraph was rephrased accordingly.

*Line 217: There is a typo in the section reference. Please correct it.*

Yes, was corrected

*Conceptual scope which can be included in the discussion but not necessary:*

*The manuscript currently emphasizes applications in forest ecosystems. However, the presented system is not only advantageous for forests but also highly relevant for other vegetation types, particularly grasslands, where measuring below-canopy precipitation using traditional collectors (e.g., funnels) is challenging. Briefly highlighting this broader applicability could emphasize the potential of the collector.*

Thank you for the suggestions - aspect had been included to the discussion.

*Line 240: It is unclear how the collector enables measurements of soil matric potential. Do the authors refer to the internal space allowing installation of sensors (e.g., tensiometers), or to another mechanism? Please clarify and refine the wording.*

Paragraph was rephrased for clarification.

*Line 530: The argument relating “high spatial resolution” to the collector cross-sectional area is not convincing. Spatial resolution is more appropriately determined by the number and density of samplers that can be installed within a given area, rather than the sampling area of an individual collector. Please revise this statement accordingly and avoid linking spatial resolution to collector cross-section.*

Paragraph was revised for clarification.