

Response to EC1: MS No.: egusphere-2026-1250

Andrew Axelsen, Terence O’Kane, Courtney Quinn, Andrew Bassom

May 25, 2026

Jie Feng: I have now received the comments from all three reviewers. All of them expressed concern that the manuscript lacks critical information, such as details on the methodology. In particular, Reviewers 1 and 2 both emphasized that the results are presented too qualitatively and that key physical interpretations are clearly insufficient. Given that addressing these weaknesses would require considerable time, I recommend rejecting the manuscript at this stage. However, I would encourage resubmission after the authors have substantially improved the overall quality and readability of the paper.

Authors: Based on the submission distributed to the reviewers, we understand the decision to reject encouraging resubmission of our manuscript, however, from specific references to line numbers by the reviewers, it is certain that the version of the manuscript distributed was a preliminary draft that appeared on the ESSOR archive and not the version intended for review which appears on the archive as v2. The confusion of paper versions on the archive appears to have come about at the submission stage. The error was picked up almost immediately and the updated version intended for review was uploaded to the archive within a day. This was communicated to the editorial support team but, was clearly not communicated to the reviewers.

We have however, prepared detailed responses to the reviews and made additional revisions to address the points raised, noting that many, if not most, of the concerns were addressed in the manuscript intended for review.

Rather than resubmit with a new set of reviewers, we would request that we be allowed to respond and to continue the review process as we have a substantially revised and augmented paper already prepared. Most importantly, the revised submission contains many quantitative diagnostics, extended methods sections, and physical analysis not present in the variant incorrectly supplied to the reviewers.