

Responses to Reviewer #1 comments:

After reviewing the revised manuscript, the authors have appropriately addressed all the concerns. The manuscript is almost ready to be published, yet one more issue needs to be clarified. Specifically, in Fig. 8, the standardized path coefficient of SOM on BD is higher than on CP on an absolute scale, but the R² values are not consistent with this pattern; second, the total effect of SOM on the SWRC will be more than one due to its both significant direct (almost one) and indirect effects. Therefore, the authors need to check the analysis carefully or present a rational explanation for these numbers.

***Response:** Thank you for your positive comment. We would like to express our great appreciation for your valuable suggestions and comments on the previous version of the manuscript. For the Fig.8, we found the effect of BD on CP was missing, which lead to the R² values are not consistent with this pattern , we have check and corrected these.*

1. 1. line 32, a typo.

***Response:** Thank you for your careful check, we have revised.*

2. 2. The abbreviations in Fig. 8 need to be annotated in the figure legend.:

***Response:** Thank you for your comment, we have explained the abbreviations in Fig. 8.*