

Responses to comments: our replies are all in magenta color

Dear Dr. Eyal Rotenberg as editor and fellow reviewers,

We would like to thank you for not only taking your valuable time to assess our MS, but also for your useful and practical scientific added-value discussions, comments, remarks and suggestions, that we had even through direct emails. We tried to answer your comments.

Responses to editor:

Dear Hamadou and the co Authors,

After lengthy discussions, sometimes even via direct exchange emails, I am happy to let you know that the paper, from my side, is almost ready for publication. I think this process helps much to strengthen and clarify the article, which you and the readers will gain. Left are the following two comments which you are asked to consider:

1. In your answer to reviewer 1, referring to lines 185 -192, I found the below part of the sentence unclear and needs your clarification:

“This hyperbolic model approximates only the data behaviour and supports the theoretical...”.

2. Challenging is to read Figure 6 legends; consider using common legend, for the X-axis and the Y-axis, instead of the current format.

I sincerely hope that the paper will be well received by the scientific community, as the reviewers received it, and I wish you the best in your future activities.

Kind regards, Eyal.

This was changed to page 6, line 185-192: “ We used a hyperbolic model to relate GPP to SIF<sub>d</sub> following (Damm et al., 2015; Kim et al., 2021)”. The phrase was deleted because it described the results, instead of explaining the methodology used.

Challenging is to read Figure 6 legends: “Considering common legend, for X and Y axes, the Figure 6 was changed”.

Note that for the same reason mentioned in Figure 6, all figures regarding observed GPP vs RF predicted GPP was changed by keeping common legend for X and Y axes within the MS and Supplementary Materials as well.