

We thank the editors and reviewers for their comments. Specific comments are addressed below:

I just noticed that your figures 2 and A1 contain satellite or airborne images. If you are not the originator of the images, then appropriate credit or copyright must be given. If applicable, please add the necessary details to the figure or the figure caption. Please make sure that the figure or caption contains the appropriate image credit as this is the responsibility of the authors.

We made these figures and the images within ourselves. We clarified that the images are derived from POLDER-3 in the captions, but the images were produced by original code written by the authors.

Dear authors, thank you for making changes based on the reviewer's recommendation. The reviewer had asked for a more quantitative assessment in the conclusions, and I still do not quite see that. A qualitative addition has been made. Could you please take another look and try to make things more quantitative (use some quality metrics instead of "good agreement")? Otherwise the conclusions will remain a bit vague. Please make sure that you did in fact address the reviewer's recommendations thoroughly, or state why you did not do that.

We added specific numbers to support the statements in the conclusion about the quantitative results.