

Thank you very much for the constructive review of our manuscript, also for appreciating this work and supporting to improve it by valuable remarks and suggestions within the manuscript. We carefully went through all the comments and revised the manuscript accordingly. Replies to comments relating to specific lines, paragraphs or tables have been incorporated accordingly. Since the upload of the revised manuscript is not possible during this stage of publishing, revised sections are given by page and line number. Additionally, we address specific questions and major points of the reviewer below.

Reviewer #2:

Terminology / notation pass: Define/contrast LAI vs PAI early (site LAI of 7.1 near the tower vs domain-mean PAI of 4.65 used by the model) and maintain consistent symbols; a reader-aid table would help.

Thank you for the valuable input. The following was added in the method section describing the "2D Rutter Model" and the spatial distribution of the PAI in the study domain (Figure 1):

"The resulting spatially variable PAI_{Local} of the study domain is presented in figure 1 with an overall PAI of $4.65m^2m^{-2}$ and a PAI of $6.54m^2m^{-2}$ for the area of the gutter measurements used for the canopy water balance approach. Please note that this values are somewhat smaller than the LAI given in the description of the study site, as they are i) methodologically different measures and ii) not related to the same source area. The LAI of 7.1 around the measurement tower refers to the total projected leaf area per unit ground area and is a result of continuous in-canopy radiation measurements during the year 2008. The PAI includes both leaves and woody components and was derived from the above mentioned 3D representation of the forest." (page 7: line 184-190)

Winter caveat in the main text: You already flag that LE_{WB} can exceed LE_{EB} in Jan/Dec and that snow isnt explicitly handled. Consider a one-sentence caveat in the Abstract or Conclusions to prevent over-generalization?

Thank you, this is a very valuable suggestion. We added that the evaluated results refer to liquid rainfall conditions for which our approach "provides appropriate evaporation rates from intercepted liquid precipitation for the analyzed forest ecosystem" (page 1: line 13).

In the discussion we are also mentioning the limitation of our study:

"However, the model was only validated for liquid rainfall conditions and frost-free periods, since throughfall measurements are only reliable during these conditions. The application of the results to the whole year, especially situations with snowfall, should be further investigated. Firstly, there is a lack of reference data and secondly, the modelling approach does not differentiate between solid and liquid precipitation.

We expect that our combined water and energy balance adjustment approach LE_{WB} is still plausible, since snow interception for DE-Tha is estimated less than 2% if distinguishing these processes (Vorobevskii et al., 2022)." (page 16: line 501)

Share code? If feasible, provide a repository link for the 2-D Rutter implementation (Appendix A) and the footprint-weighting workflow to accelerate adoption.

The source code of the 2-D Rutter approach is available here <https://github.com/Ron-Q/CanWat> and another description can be found here: <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33956.59529>.

For the footprint calculation we used the R code from <http://footprint.kljun.net/index.php> in a slightly modified form. However, we would prefer not to publish the changes in the source code, as these obstacles may have been deliberately introduced by Natasha Kljun to prevent the code from being used without careful consideration. An application example for the calculation of the mask is added to the Git repository (https://github.com/Ron-Q/CanWat/blob/main/Sub/auxiliary/footprint_2D_short.R).