

## Author Response to Referees

Thank you for these comments and recommendations. Responses are given below.

The referee response is given in *italic purple text*, whereas the author responses as a list of changes are given in non-italic text under each referee response. In the edited paper, changes to the text are indicated in a *blue color*.

### Referee #1

*L53-76: This section could be shortened.*

Eleven lines at the beginning of the section has been removed to shorten this section (L53).

*L95-99: This is a long sentence. I recommend shortening it.*

P3: The sentence has been shortened and the revision is indicated by blue text.

*L155: The transition from introduction material to objectives is rather abrupt. Can the author articulate a research gap or need here that paves the way for the objectives?*

A research gap and need has been added to P5 before the objectives.

*Section 5.2: There are still a few instances in here where the author is providing student feedback on their teaching instead of the circuit activity only. Can these be removed?*

Student feedback provided on instructor teaching in Section 5.2 has been removed from the paper.

*Figure 12: I'm not sure this figure is helpful. I recommend removing it.*

Figure 12 has now been removed from the paper, along with the paragraph discussing this figure in Section 5.2.

### Referee #2: Nilay Dogulu

*I would like to thank the author for improving the manuscript in line with the comments provided by the editor and reviewers. It is a long paper but it definitely conveys ideas and arguments clearly for the broader geosciences community. I am happy with the current version (only two suggestions >>> P3 L95: Dixon et al. 2020 shall be cited for WMO HydroHub too & P22 L688: teachers > lecturers). Thanks, Nilay.*

P3: [Dixon et al 2020](#) has now been added to provide a citation near the WMO HydroHub link.

P21: The word “[teachers](#)” is now “[lecturers](#)” in the revised version.