

General comment

I appreciate that the authors have adequately addressed all previous comments. From my perspective, no major issues remain, only a few minor corrections are needed to further improve the clarity and consistency of the manuscript.

I would also like to thank the Editor for managing the review process of this manuscript efficiently and professionally.

Please refer to the minor comments listed below for final adjustments.

Minor Comments

L256-261 In my opinion, it is not necessary to include these sentences, as they describe basic and well-known technical procedures especially for scientific audience. Therefore, I recommend deleting the following lines “These time periods were chosen ...”

L710 The term “*GPP Index*” is still present in the manuscript. Please revise it to maintain consistency with the agreed terminology, “*Monthly Ecosystem Productivity Index (MEPI)*”, throughout the entire text.

L719 (See L370, previous review round). Since the global burned area comparison does not exhibit a strong correlation, and Figure 4 already presents a comparison between predicted and observed burned area (GFED5) using GFED regional boundaries, I suggest maintaining consistency in the analysis.

Specifically, please revise Figure A4 by changing it from an interannual global comparison to an interannual comparison by GFED regional boundaries, to better complement and strengthen the results shown in Figure 4.

Accordingly, Figure A4 about “Interannual Comparison by GFED Regional Boundaries”, and Figure B5 as “Seasonal Comparison by GFED5 Regional Boundaries” for clarity and coherence.