

Explanation of content and value adjustment:

In final review of the manuscript, I noticed that some of the values cited in the text of the paper differed from the values included in the tables. I checked the values against most recent data or sources, and some of the values included in the text are incorrect, associated with earlier versions of the data set, which has since been improved. These changes are marked up in the attached manuscript. I apologize for the oversight. The affected data are:

Page 8, Lines 46-53: Pearson correlation coefficients and fit parameters. The claim in line 56-59 is no longer robust, so I suggest that it be removed.

Page 9, Lines 37-38: fit parameters and pearson correlation coefficient

Page 12, Fig 5 caption: fit parameters and a change in language since the actual difference is not statistically significant

Page 12, Fig 6 caption: fit parameters

Page 13, Lines 18-19: The claim is true, but the percent values were calculated for an older version of the dataset and need to be updated.

Page 13, Lines 93-94: This claim is no longer robust with the correct data used in this study, so I suggest that it be removed.

Table 1, page 4: The MAP for El Tatio sites is 0.025 m, not 0.0025 m.

There is also a variable name change that was only partially effected throughout the paper. The relationship $w=al^c$ is sometimes written as $w=al^b$. I would like to correct this so that it is consistently $w=al^c$ throughout the manuscript. Affected lines are:

Page 9, lines 35-37: parameter b should be c

Page 12, Figure 6 caption: parameter b should be c

Page 13, Line 56: parameter b should be c