Reviewer's Comment

General Comments

In my opinion, the authors have substantially improved the manuscript, also in response to the comments from other reviewers. They have satisfactorily addressed my earlier suggestions, and I appreciate the inclusion of additional methodological details (e.g., the Mann-Kendall test) and the strengthened interpretation of the results. These revisions have made the manuscript more coherent and convincing overall.

That said, my original major comment (Comment 5) remains. Although the authors have made some modifications to the section on isotope analysis, I still find this part not well integrated with the rest of the results. However, I acknowledge the authors' rationale for not implementing more extensive changes and leave the final decision to the editor.

Technical Correction

In one of my comments, I recommended including a correlation matrix to illustrate the relationships among all variables. While the authors agreed in their response, the supplementary material includes only a simple table (Table S2). I understand and accept this decision, but the current caption refers to it as a "correlation matrix," which is not accurate. Please revise the caption accordingly.

Response to Reviewer

We thank the handling editor for the opportunity to revise our manuscript and for drawing our attention to the reviewer's helpful comment regarding the caption of Table S2.

In line with Reviewer 3's suggestion, we have updated the caption of Table S2 to more accurately describe it as a table of correlation values, rather than a "correlation matrix." This revision is reflected in the updated supplementary materials.

We would also like to express our sincere appreciation to Reviewer 2 for their thoughtful and constructive feedback throughout the review process, and for their recognition of the improvements made to the manuscript. Their insights have contributed meaningfully to the clarity and coherence of the revised work.