

Dear Editor and Corresponding Authors,

It was a pleasure reading the revised manuscript from Wang et al. The manuscript has been greatly improved from its previous version, and all my comments have been adequately addressed. I believe that the current version of the manuscript is nearly ready for publication. I have only three very minor formatting comments, none of which I believe warrant a new draft to be circulated before final acceptance.

In my previous letter, I echoed the suggestion to include chi plots of the three major rivers. In their response to Dr. Schwanghart's first comment, the authors explain that drainage area is not an effective proxy for discharge in this field area due to strong vertical and longitudinal precipitation gradients (I agree with this point). While they don't explicitly say so, the authors seem to imply that when they performed a chi analysis, the knickzones did not have similar chi values, and they attribute this to the poor correlation between drainage area and discharge (this would make sense to me). If this is indeed the case, I think it might still be useful to include the chi plots and discuss them in Lines 443-471 (dissimilar chi values due to a poor drainage area / discharge correlation is itself an interesting result potentially worthy of discussion). That being said, I think the manuscript is still suitable for publication without them, and so I will defer to the authors and the other referees on the matter.

Once again, if the authors have any specific questions regarding my comments, please feel free to contact me.

Chris Sheehan
Boston College Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences
sheehacz@bc.edu

Minor Comments:

Line 177: "(Figure 3c." should be "(Figure 3c)". There is a missing closed-parenthesis.

Line 465: "fast" should be "faster".

Figure 4a: Please add an elevation scale / color bar.
