

Response to editor's and reviewers' comments

Reply on Editor

Associate Editor decision: Publish subject to technical corrections
by Ben Bond-Lamberty

Comments to the author:

Your revision was assessed by Referee 2 (Referee 1 was not available), who is complimentary and finds all of their major concerns have been addressed. I have read the revised ms as well and agree—thank you for the comprehensive and careful response and revision. I agree with R2 that there are a few minor items in the text to deal with, but otherwise, have no further major concerns.

Minor note: the discussion has a number of very long paragraphs that it would be good to break up for readability if possible. For example, consider a paragraph break at lines 503, 530, 543, 563, and 570. Also, does the conclusions paragraph add anything? It seems to merely recapitulate; consider removing.

>>Revised. The very long paragraphs were segmented and the conclusions paragraph was removed. Please see changes in Lines 503-504, 531-532, 544-545, 565-566, 573-574 and 604-605.

Reply on Report #1

Submitted on 27 May 2022

Anonymous referee #2

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection (will be published if the paper is accepted for final publication)

The authors did a great job addressing the reviewer's concerns. I only have two minor technical revisions.

line 139: 'necessary prepared in' doesn't make sense here. Should it read 'already prepared in', or 'necessary for'?

>>Revised. Please see changes in Line 139.

line 502-503: This sentence is a little awkward. I suggest:

'Among all the cases with fertilizer application depth or irrigation/precipitation (38 total cases), 16% (6 cases) had an RMB greater than 150%.'

>>Revised. Please see changes in Lines 502-503.