

Response to reviewer #1:

The authors have addressed most of my comments in their revised version of this paper and the model experiment is now more clearly presented and easier to follow. I would, however, still recommend another round of revisions due to the many language issues particularly in the newly added parts of the paper. Such editing should be done by a native speaker or a professional language editing service to further increase the paper's impact. I also find 14 figures is a rather large number and the authors could consider merging figures and/or move some material to the Appendix.

Response:

Thanks for your comments. We have checked the language issues thoroughly, especially in the newly added parts, through the language editing software Grammarly. Also, we merged some figures and reduce the figure number to 11.

Response to reviewer #2:

Thanks for the authors' revision. I think the authors have addressed most of my comments, only one point I want to further point out that the author should claim their work focus on water and river sampling strategy (frequency and spatial resolution etc.) in the 'introduction' part, and this will make the readers understand why they do not sample the glacier and snow-melt water samples.

Response:

Thanks for your comments. We have clarify that this study focus on the sampling of precipitation and river sampling in the introduction part.