

### **Recommendation: Minor Revision**

The revised manuscript shows clear improvement in both structure and scientific clarity compared to the original submission. The authors have responded to most of the previous concerns appropriately, and the current version is more coherent, with enhanced data presentation and interpretation. However, several minor issues remain that should be addressed before final acceptance. My detailed comments are as follows:

#### **1. Overall evaluation**

The newly revised manuscript demonstrates substantial improvement over the previous version, particularly in terms of organization, clarity of data presentation, and interpretation of results. The current version is more scientifically rigorous and readable.

#### **2. Line 26**

Please provide the data sources for the two datasets mentioned. Citing the origin of the data is essential for reproducibility and transparency.

#### **3. Lines 122 and 145**

“table S1” should be capitalized as “Table S1” in both instances to conform to academic writing standards.

#### **4. Lines 281–283**

This section requires a more specific and nuanced explanation. The current sentence vaguely attributes the underestimation and delayed ET rise to spatial differences and vegetation dependence. I suggest the authors clarify that **remote sensing data loss during frequent precipitation events** could be a contributing factor to the underestimation and lag in ET rise. For instance, at **DE-Hai (broad-leaved forest)** and **DE-Ruw (coniferous forest)**, ICOS ET remains consistently lower than other products and shows a delayed seasonal increase. These discrepancies may be due to **differences in the spatial resolution of the ET products and their sensitivity to vegetation phenology**.

5. **Lines 487–488**

The statement "Reason for that are... reduced transpiration of agricultural sites throughout the year compared to forested sites" is too general and potentially oversimplified. Please provide a more detailed explanation. For example:

*"DE-Rus, classified as an agricultural site located in a non-irrigated zone, shows relatively low vegetation cover (e.g., mean NDVI value if available). This can lead to underestimation of ET in that pixel when using models that rely on vegetation indices. Combined with the site's seasonal vegetation dynamics and lack of irrigation, this explains the lower ET values compared to forested areas with more consistent canopy cover."*