

*Dear Editor,*

*Thank you very much for your positive feedback and for guiding our manuscript through the final steps of the review process. We are thrilled to hear that our previous revisions addressed the reviewers' concerns well.*

*We have carefully implemented your suggestions regarding the harmonization of the study goals and the structure of the final sections. Below, we detail the specific changes made to the manuscript:*

*Following your suggestion, we have carefully aligned the statement of our study goals to ensure a consistent emphasis throughout the manuscript. We integrated the specific focus mentioned in our previous response ("investigating the potentialities of the MOD10A1 product"). This harmonized aim is now consistently stated at the end of the Introduction, at the beginning of the Discussion, and in the opening of the Conclusion section.*

*Merging Discussion and conclusions was a request of one of the revisors. We completely agree that separating the sections helps the goals and main achievements stand out much more clearly. We have now split the previous combined section into two distinct sections: "4. Discussion" and "5. Conclusions". We also have carefully reviewed and revised the specific lines you highlighted (former Lines 276–278 and Lines 305–306 regarding the "Avanzi" references) to improve readability, correct stylistic phrasing, and ensure a clearer scientific flow.*

*We are very grateful for your valuable and meticulous editorial work, which has undoubtedly improved the final quality of our paper. We hope that the revised manuscript is now fully ready for publication.*

*Sincerely,*

*Luigi Perotti, on behalf of all co-authors*