

We would like to thank the editor and both reviewers for their valuable feedback throughout the process.

This document lists all the changes, and responses to the reviewers' comments. The changes have also been highlighted in the .pdf document. For reference, we have kept the **original comments in bold blue text**, and the changes done in the final document are in normal text.

Changes based on comments by the editor

Before actual publication, however, I would ask you to take into account the minor suggestions left by the two referees. In particular, I encourage you to consider the suggestion of structuring your discussion section more clearly. With over 3 pages of continuous text, I agree that introducing some sub-sections would be useful. I imagine that the required sub-section headings will also help in bundling individual topics of discussion.

Thank you for the suggestion. The discussion section was structured to split up the text into subsections. This will help with the readability. The subsections were created such that it will highlight the four main topics discussed: comparison to GNSS measurements, pressure data, number of deployments, and comparison with GPR, perspectives and limitations.

In addition, small typos were corrected throughout the paper.

Changes based on comments by Ugo Nanni

There are two points that could be more highlighted:

1) how this method could be used in other setup and by other people ? While people can easily conduct GPR, seismic or water pressure measurements, this method seems to be difficult to apply by other teams.

We added a small comment in the discussion section about the usability of the devices. The devices are small, inexpensive, and easy to use. As mentioned in the limitations of the paper, the main difficulty with the current prototypes is the retrieval.

In regards to the usage of other people: The devices are still in a prototype stage and not commercially available. Other interested users are therefore best advised to take direct contact with the authors.

2) in the discussion the authors mainly compare their results to GPR (which gives the drainage geometry) and not too much to seismic measurements (which give insights on hydraulic properties), I suggest to briefly discuss how their method could complement such measurements.

A brief description on how the drifter measurements seismic can complement each other has been added.

The discussion should also be a bit more structured. Most of the material is there now, but the structure without any section is a bit confusing, and jumping back and forth from methodological to thematical discussions. I suggest clarifying this.

The discussion section was structured to split up the text into subsections. This will help with the readability.

Changes based on comments by Elizabeth Bagshaw

Accept as is.