

Responses to Reviewers

1st Reviewer

I congratulate the authors with this revised version. In my view all points raised were adequately dealt with. I still found some language issues in the ms, shown below. And I do suggest the authors to critically look for misspellings and unclear sentences.

Reply: Thank you very much. In the revised draft. We addressed all these questions from the feedback and made corrections accordingly. In addition, we also carefully went over the draft again and made some additional changes.

1. P3L20. Over ->above

Reply: Thank you. We have corrected this.

2. P3L22 composed by -> of

Reply: Thank you. We have changed this.

3. P5L6 Grassholf -> Grasshoff

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it.

4. P6L3-4 For the magnitude of DIN fluxes (Q) that transported to the coastal ocean, it can be estimated according to the following equation: Replace by TDIN fluxes (Q) transported to the coastal ocean were estimated according to the following equation:

Reply: Thank you. In the revised draft, we have replaced the sentence accordingly.

5. P6L25: unsaturated ->undersaturated

Reply: Thank you. We have changed the expression in the revised manuscript.

6. P11L28:found, indicating (insert that)

Reply: Thank you. We have added that in the sentence.

7. P11L29: benefit -> invoke??

Reply: Thank you. We would like express that PN could not increase nitrate addition. In the revised draft, we changed benefit to enhance.

8. P11L31: accelerate (delete s)

Reply: Thank you. We have removed s from this word.

9. P12L12: ...worth noticing that (replace that with the)

Reply: Thank you. We have changed 'that' to 'the' in the revised draft.

10. P12L20 replace productivity with producers

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it (P12, L27 now).

11. P12L31. phytoplankton species: replace species with group

Reply: Thank you. We have changed 'species' to 'group'.

12. P12L32replace "is flourished" with "flourishes"

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it.

2nd Reviewer

I am happy to find that authors made corrections according to our suggestions. I do not have any major questions about the manuscript. Before publication, I believe authors could improve the draft with some minor changes.

Reply: Thank you. We modified the manuscript according to these suggestions.

For main text:

1. Line 12, Page 2: please add δ in front of ^{15}N -PN

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it.

2. Line 11, Page 3, please add 'the' in front of El Niño-Southern Oscillation

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it.

3. Line 11, Page 8: It should be 'Isotope fractions were'.

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it.

4. Line 29, Page 9, Both Müller-Dum et al., 2018; Martin et al., 2018 have published, please add volume and page number in the reference list.

Reply: Thank you. We added the information in the reference list and made changes in the main text.

5. Line 21, Page 10: Passive voice should be better, 'DON may be continuously transformed to...'

Reply: Thank you. We have used passive voice in the revised draft.

For figures

1. Figure 1 legend, please change 'in the Borneo' to 'in Borneo'

Reply: Thank you. We have changed this expression.

2. Figure 2 legend, please remove 'isotope fraction'

Reply: Thank you. We have removed it.

3. The authors used 'the Rajang estuary' in the manuscript, in some legends, they used 'the Rajang Estuary' instead, please change them.

Reply: Thank you. We used 'the Rajang estuary' in all legends in the revised draft.

For Table

1. I did not find Lida et al. 2007 in the reference list, I found Iida et al. 2007 who took a study in the Mekong River, please check the reference.

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it.

For Supply:

1. Authors added a photo in the response to describe the cloudy water in the Rajang River. I believe they could include the photo(s) in the supply. The readers will gain a clearer vision on the Rajang River.

Reply: Thank you. In the revised draft, we added two photos in the supply (Fig. S1) and invoked these photos in the main text.

2. Table S1, please use italic 'f'

Reply: Thank you. We have modified it.

3. Table S1, I believe the riverine NO₃⁻ concentration is Fig. 7, not Fig. S9 to S11

Reply: Thank you. We have changed it.