

Reviewer Comments

The authors have addressed the majority of my previous comments satisfactorily, and I believe the manuscript has been substantially improved. The observational dataset and the associated analyses provide valuable scientific contributions, and I am generally supportive of publication.

Nevertheless, I still have one concern regarding the numerical modelling approach. The computational domain appears to simplify the two connecting channels into a single equivalent channel. Since frictional effects play a key role in the propagation and attenuation of long barotropic waves, such a simplification may influence the simulated water-level gradients, flow velocities, and consequently the circulation patterns within both the channels and the lake.

To strengthen the credibility of the numerical results, I encourage the authors to provide additional evidence demonstrating that this simplification does not significantly affect the conclusions. This could be achieved, for example, by:

- (i) comparing the simplified configuration with a model that explicitly represents the two individual channels, showing that the differences are negligible; or
- (ii) presenting a comparison between simulated and measured water levels and/or current velocities at the observation stations to demonstrate that the simplified model reproduces the observed hydrodynamics with reasonable accuracy.

Although I do not regard this issue as a fundamental obstacle to publication, I believe that some additional justification of the modelling assumptions would increase confidence in the numerical results. I therefore leave it to the Editor's discretion whether this clarification should be requested before the manuscript is accepted.