

## Response to the Editor

We thank the Editor for the final review of the manuscript. We respond to the minor comments below. Line numbers refer to the manuscript with track changes.

- *Calibration for the Paris example: "The question arises why averaged ETo (August 1985 – 2005) was chosen as input data for a specific defined heat wave. Wouldn't it have and more appropriate to calculate ETo for mid-August using the FAO ETOcalculator."*

*Response: We agree that using the FAO ETO-calculator is another option. However, in order to minimize differences in model inputs, we have decided to use the outputs from the ALADIN model that is also used in the reference (modeled) data*

*Editor: Could you explain physical implications of this decision to use ETo in this study?*

*Response: We note that using ETo is a requirement for this model (as opposed to actual ET). However, we agree that readers might want more details on the implications of our choice, and we have also added some text to that effect (l. 175): "Using long-term average reference evapotranspiration instead of 2003 reference evapotranspiration has a limited effect on outputs given that the InVEST model only uses relative values (see Eq. 3 above), which have lower temporal variability than absolute values."*

- *"Other improvements are minor and of technical nature (as documented in the source code)."*

>> Please add the information on minor and technical improvements in the main text, not in the source code.

*Response: We have added the details of the improvements (l. 220): "They include testing for the compatibility of user inputs, updating deprecated packages, and improving the code efficiency and readability".*

- The author added the sentence of "We selected these metrics since MAE and RMSE are useful quantification of the uncertainty 220 in model outputs, which is important from a user perspective."

>> Could you add references to explain why this is important from a user perspective and what a user perspective implies?

*Response: We have added the following details (l. 222): "Following previous work (Bosch et al., 2021), we selected these metrics since MAE and RMSE are useful quantification of the uncertainty in model outputs with physical quantities (expressed in °C), which is important for users to understand the impact of errors."*

- Can you show the distance as km, not latitude/longitude in all maps in the figures (Fig. 1-3)

Response: We thank the editor for the suggestion to improve figures. We note that distances are conveyed by the scale bar and are expressed in km, while the tick marks on the figures refer to the latitudes and longitudes. We have changed them to geographic coordinates (latitude and longitude) for easier reading and following best practice.