

Reviewer #2: 1) RMSPE are mentioned as the model misfit metric used but they are not reported. Were all RMSPE values under the 10% threshold?

Reply: We thank the reviewer for this remark. We confirm that all inverted models successfully reached RMSPE values below the 10% threshold. To address this comment, we have now explicitly reported the specific RMSPE values directly in the caption of Figure 3 for each site.

Reviewer #2: 2) Authors mention in their response that Figure 2, more specifically Figure 2C, will be modified in accordance with the reviewer's comments. However, if I am not mistaken, Figure 2C has remained the same in the updated version of the manuscript.

Reply: We thank the reviewer for the observation, but we kindly point out that Figure 2C has indeed been modified in the revised manuscript. Specifically, the bottom boundary of the electrical resistivity section in Figure 2C was cropped and masked according to the model sensitivity distribution (provided in Figure S2C of the Supplementary Material). The deep regions characterized by low sensitivity, which were included at the bottom of the original inversion model of the manuscript, have now been trimmed. Consequently, the updated Figure 2C displays only the inversion area supported by reliable model sensitivity. A direct side-by-side comparison of the original and revised figures clearly highlights this geometric modification along the lower profile of the section.