

Review HESS

General comments:

The authors have generally well addressed the comments made on the first version of the manuscript. Although the wording and grammar can still be improved (I understand writing in English is difficult for non-native English speakers), the science is understandable. After reading the response to reviewers the authors provided, I have some minor comments to add.

I would reorganize the discussion section; I would start by discussing the RWC to riparian trees (section 4.2 in the current version) which is the main objective of this study. Then, I would discuss the link between RWC, WUE and WTD (section 4.3) and end the discussion with the strength/limitations of the method you used (section 4.1). I would also try to improve the link/flow between the points discussed, sometimes it is difficult to understand why you move from one point to another.

Technical comments:

The number before each comment below refers to the number given to each comment on the response to reviewers.

14. Line 175: Can you clarify; the mean or the median of the water source contributions?

15. Lines 185-187 + 60. Lines 165-168: I would rewrite the section "The average soil WI values at depths of 0-5 cm, For the 0-30 cm soil for the 170-300 cm soil layer", the sentences are not clear. For example, you could say: "The average soil WI value for the 0-30 cm soil layer was determined as the average of the soil WI values of the 0-5 cm, 5-10 cm and 20-30 cm soil layers.", and "Similarly, we determined the average soil WI values for the 30-80 cm (average of 40-60 cm and 60-80 cm soil layers), 80-170 cm (average of 90-110 cm and 150-170 cm soil layers) and 170-300 cm (average of ...) soil layers".

23. Lines 299-304: I would give the p values as $p < XX$ instead of $p = 0.000$.

31. Lines 38-40: I would divide the last sentence ("Therefore, understanding [...] revegetated riparian zones") in two, for clarity and readability.

73. Lines 224-229: I would rewrite the sentence "ANOVA [...] different variables", "incorporating" does not seem to be the right word. I would clarify why each of these tests were performed, also clarify "to investigate the statistic differences of different variables". For example, you could say: "For each variable, we tested the homogeneity of variance between the 2 studied years and between the 3 plots using the Levene's test." ..., be more precise about why you performed each test.

Figure 6: I would check the wording, grammar and correct the sentences 2 and 3 of the caption. Maybe something like: "The LMWL was determined for each year from the precipitation samples taken over each year", and "The SWL was determined for each year and plot from the soil water samples taken each year"?

Figure 9: Correct "contributions of water sources to ripaRIAN groundwater" on the y axis.

Figure 11: I would use "contribution of river water to riparian trees" instead of "proportion" on the y axis for consistency. I would also give the p values as $p < XX$ instead of $p = 0.000$.

Figure S1: Correct the references to the panels in the caption (for example: air temperature and VPD are shown on panels a and b, not c and d).