Dear reviewer 2,

We are so grateful for the excellent suggestions and the detailed revising from you. We have benefited greatly by the revision. Now we explain your questions firstly point by point, and then made modification accordingly.

Reviewers' comments:
The authors did great improvement of the paper quality since the first submission. However the conclusion should be improved to better highlight the work that have been done during this research. A conscientious proof-reading should be done to correct the remaining grammar mistakes in the text.

**Response:** Thanks for the excellent suggestion on our manuscript. We had rewrote the “Conclusions” section.

Specific comments / grammar:
#Line 121: inertval  
**Response:** I am very sorry for the spelling mistake. We had revised the “inertval” as “interval”.

#Line 166: m area should be m2 area (same on lines 167-169, 211)  
**Response:** Thanks for the great suggestion. We had revised the “135 × 215 m area” as “135 m × 215 m area”, (same on lines 167-169, 211).

#Line 184: what is 5h3?  
**Response:** I am very sorry for the mistake. We had deleted the “5h3”.

Kind regards,
Xiaoqiang Han & Wei Fu
2019.4.22