

**Point-by-Point Response to Review Comments**

---

**Manuscript Title:** Increased Nonstationarity of Stormflow Threshold Behaviors in a Forested Watershed Due to Abrupt Earthquake Disturbance

**Authors:** Guotao Zhang, Peng Cui\*, Carlo Gualtieri, Nazir Ahmed Bazai, Xueqin Zhang, Zhengtao Zhang

**Manuscript ID:** hess-2022-315

Key Laboratory of Land Surface Pattern and Simulation,  
Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS),  
Beijing 100101, China

(**C** and **R** denote Comment and Reply, respectively)

---

**Response to Editor (Genevieve Ali) Comments:**

**C:** Thanks for addressing comments from the last round of review. I am returning your manuscript for minor editorial corrections (suggested by one reviewer who has seen all your manuscript versions). I look forward to receiving the revised version.  
With best wishes,

Genevieve Ali

**R:** We are very grateful for valuable suggestions from the editor and the reviewer for their positive assessments of our work. At present, we have completely addressed the comments point by point from the Reviewer as below. We also hope that this study with the interconnection of hydrological sciences and flash flood disasters could be considered for publication in the “*Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*”.

## Response to Reviewer's Comments:

**C1:** Summary: I appreciate that the effort addressed the comments made by public and formal reviewers on earlier versions of the manuscript. I think that the manuscript has been improved significantly and I only identified small editorial issues that should be addressed.

**R1:** We are very grateful for having the summary of your positive assessments and appreciation of our work. The point-by-point comments have been addressed below. We also hope that this study with the interconnection of hydrological sciences and flash flood disasters could be considered for publication in the “*Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*”.

**C2:** Specific Suggestions:L113: Consider changing the phrasing from “...the forest land had a 19.9% shrinkage percentage...” to “After the earthquake, the forest land decreased by 19.9%”.

**R2:** I agree with you. The sentence has been modified in the revised manuscript (Please see Lines 112-113).

**C3:** L122: I believe that “...dominant runoff sources...” should be “...dominant runoff source...”.

**R3:** I agree with you. The sentence has been modified in the revised manuscript (Please see Line 122).

**C4:** L215: Is there a word missing at “...patchiness of the post-earthquake watershed underlying and unevenness...”?

**R4:** Thanks for your comments and kind reminder. The sentence should be “Due to the fragmentation of the post-earthquake watershed’s landscapes (Yunus et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021b) and the unevenness of monitoring locations for different land use (Farrick and

Branfireun, 2014”). (Please see Lines 215-216 in the revised manuscript).

**C5:** L244: Consider “...useful to understand...”, rather than “...useful for understand...”.

**R5:** I agree with you. The sentence has been modified in the revised manuscript (Please see Line 244).

**C6:** L295: Can the similarity identified with Tunas et al. (2020) be explained more clearly.

**R6:** Thanks for your pointing it out. The phenomenon with increased peak discharge and the advanced time to peak is almost consistent with Tunas et al. (2020) in the Bangga River Basin affected by the 2018 Palu Earthquake in Indonesia. (Please see Lines 295-296)

**C7:** L334: Consider “antecedent wetness conditions” rather than “antecedent wet conditions”.

**R7:** I agree with you. The sentence has been modified in the revised manuscript (Please see Lines 335).

**C8:** L336: Conder “wider” or “widened” rather than “widen”.

**R8:** I agree with you. The sentence has been modified in the revised manuscript (Please see Lines 337).