

We truly appreciate the comments and suggestions. We have revised the manuscript accordingly. The point-by-point responses are given below.

Comments to the Author from the Co-Editor

Both reviewers agree that you have well addressed their comments and find your paper nearly ready for publication. However, reviewer #2 has a few suggestions for further small changes, which I think you should take into account for a final submission of your paper.

A: We have made necessary changes to incorporate reviewer #2's suggestions in the revision.

Reviewer #2

1. Reply to Comment 2: Section 2.2 should be updated with part of the response given in the reply

A: We have updated Section 2.2 with the parts of the response given in the previous reply (P4, L15-22).

2. Pg. 9 L. 10: a link to ucar is given here pointing to non-peer review material. Please refer to peer-review work which is available on this subject.

A: The link has been replaced by the peer-review reference (P9, L16).

3. Reply to Comment 4: Please mention in Sec. 3.1 or elsewhere that the choice of the threshold contour is a subjective element of your study. The 50% contour is now only mentioned in the caption of Fig. 2.

A: We have clarified the choice of the threshold contour in Section 3.1 (P5, L28-29). The 0.27 mm mon⁻¹ threshold contour is plotted to highlight the area contributing most (88.3%) of moisture to the study area. We plotted the 50% contour to show the core area contributing half of moisture to the study area. However, the core area is obvious in figure 2 so we decided to remove the 50% contour in the revision (P18, L4-5).