

Round 2, Reviewer 1 Comments:

“Performance Evaluation of Multi-Source Methane Emissions Quantification Models Using Fixed-Point Continuous Monitoring Systems”

July 3rd, 2025

Dear Authors,

Thank you for taking the time to incorporate my comments into this draft of your paper. The science questions I had earlier have all been addressed well. I still have a few general comments on the writing and editing of the paper that I would like to see improved by the next draft round:

- The introduction is much better and more concise now, good job! I don't think you need Appendix A at all.
- Recommend making the following sections in “Data” for the paragraphs that already exist: “Measurements” for L130-144, “Field Site” for L146-153, and “Controlled Releases” for L155-183.
- I'm confused by the appendices. I think they should just be moved to a supplement.
- I still feel that the methods section is too long and over-explanatory. I echo reviewer 2's comment that many of the explanation in the methodology is already described in the literature. Keep moving more to the supplement and remain focused on the key point of the paper, i.e. the results and discussion sections. You can have 1-2 paragraphs explaining the model, then refer the reader to the supplement to learn more specific things about the model.
- The results and discussion are also very long and could be edited down to fewer and shorter paragraphs.
- Style/Structure: I'd really like to see the writing itself edited down to reduce the wordy-ness. You could cut at least 20% of the text and still communicate your ideas well. Keep sentences shorter and concise. Pare down the paragraphs to focus on a main point. An editor would be useful.

I look forward to reading the next draft of your paper.