

Review of 'Variations in quantity, composition and grain size of Changjiang sediment discharging into the sea in response to human activities' by Gao et al

The authors have done a good job at addressing the review comments. The paper is markedly improved from the initial version.

However, the paper is still very complex and for someone not intimately familiar with the region and the hydrological structure, at many times you are not totally confident you fully understand what is going on.

It could be argued that the paper is just trying to do too much. It would be much simpler if the focus was just on sediment change or the biogeochemical/sedimentological impacts.

Nevertheless, the authors have done a good job at better explaining the source of the hydrology and sediment transport data. However, there is still no quality control information provided for the data and, given that the publications in Chinese, there is an element of trust required here. Given the complexity (as stated above) of the paper, there is a large element of simply just trusting what has been done is correct.

Overall the paper is suitable for publication if the issues below are addressed.

1. The 2nd half of the abstract reads to be a little lacklustre and does not really provide the reader with the full breadth of the interesting findings reported here. This could be improved.
2. The figures all need to be larger with larger font sizes. While they are greatly improved from the original submission, they are next to impossible to read. Please improve. This is a huge frustration
3. There are numerous grammatical and English errors throughout the text. The paper requires a thorough revision. I have made some comments below on this topic but please check carefully as there are many other issues.

Other issues

Abstract, line 717. This is a very long sentence

Line 815. What do you mean by 'discrepant'?

Figure 1 caption. This is not a sketch! Just start the caption with 'Changjiang catchment.....'

Figure 4. The figure is extremely difficult to read. Make bigger. The dates are near impossible to read.

Line 1010. I am a little lost here. I presume you are referring to Table 1? This paragraph is difficult to comprehend. There seems to be several themes running.

Line 1023. I'm a little confused. Are you referring to Figure 6 here?

Line 1069. 'the' before 'Sediment'

Line 1070. 'flowing' or 'following'?

Line 1096. 'were the dominant sediment source'

Line 1122 and paragraph. I found this paragraph difficult to read. I don't follow the sentence 'Considering the contribution.....'

Line 1147. I don't follow what you mean by 'The increment of reservoir storage capacity.....'