We thank the reviewer and the editor for their insightful and helpful feedback. We have addressed the comments and incorporated the suggestions into our manuscript. In the text below, answers to the reviewer´s and editor´s comments are written in italics, and changes made to the manuscript text are underlined.

Reviewer´s comments (May 15, 2024):

I would suggest that a table be added to section 3.1 that outlines, for each of the 5 sites, standard model skill metrics for the fuel moisture model, including, RMSE, R^2, bias, as well as the NSE.
It is important that the authors are up front about the model skill, and that the reader is provided with the information required to assess the skill of the model.
This model is used later in the analysis to predict C02 fluxes, so the onus is on the authors to show that the model has predictive skill.

We have added a Table in section 3.1, including the standard model skill metrics suggested by the reviewer.

Table 2. Standard model skill metrics for the wood moisture model

Sites	Performance metrics			
	RMSE	R^2	MBE	NSE
Wet rainforest	70.8	0.5	-44.9	0.1
Dry rainforest	71.2	0.1	-11.1	0.04
Sclerophyll	51.8	0.4	3.2	0.4
Wet savanna	23.2	0.3	-5.9	0.2
Dry savanna	6	0.01	-0.5	-2.8

RMSE = Root mean squared error, R^2 = Coefficient of determination, MBE = Mean Bias Error, NSE = Nash-Sutcliffe efficiency.

Editor´s comments:

The corrections you made in the coding and the manuscript led to a substantial improvement which was also acknowledged by reviewer #2. I have decided that still some minor revisions are necessary before the mansucript can be accepted. Please follow the suggestion of the reviewer to add a table to section 3.1 that outlines, for each of the 5 sites, standard model skill metrics for the fuel moisture model, including, RMSE, R^2, bias, as well as the NSE. I noticed that your discussion starts with a partial recap of results and methods especially in the first paragraph. I suggest that you remove this because it is not necessary and makes the manuscript unnecessarily long. In a discussion you should discuss results, and not repeat results and methods.

In addition to the table in section 3.1 (see previous comment), we have deleted the introductory paragraph in the discussion section.