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.