

## **Response to reviewers**

*We are **grateful and thank** Reviewer#1 for thorough assessment of our manuscript and for providing us constructive comments and suggestions.*

*In the revised version, **all the comments and suggestions have been taken into account** and changes have been made to improve the presentation.*

*We now add point-by-point reply (in italics, in red color fonts) to the comments and suggestions of the reviewer and make clear where and what changes have been made in the revised version of the manuscript.*

### **Reviewer #1**

**Comment.** This manuscript reports on the differences between gullies formed on different substrates on Mars. Martian gullies are widespread, relatively young, features in the mid-latitudes, with similarities with some types of gully on Earth. Given the possibility of debris-flow processes being present, these features are important in attempts to understand fluidization processes on Mars. The manuscript is a timely addition to body of work on martian gullies.

Overall the manuscript is excellent, and it is a pleasure to say that I think that it should be accepted without any changes. The justification for this recommendation is that the study is well-designed, has been carried out to an excellent standard, interpretations are sound without speculation, and the conclusions make a solid contribution to our understanding of martian gullies.

***Response:*** *We sincerely thank the reviewer for this assessment and providing a summary of our paper. We acknowledge the reviewer for providing a positive feedback on our manuscript.*