

The authors have made substantial revisions that address most of the concerns raised in the previous round. Two items remain before I can recommend acceptance.

1. ABLATION INTERPRETATION (Section 3.4, Table 4)

The ablation study reports an MAE reduction of 0.035°C (Config-2 vs Config-1) from adding multi-head attention alone, and 0.044°C (Config-3 vs Config-1) from adding KNN-based similarity augmentation alone. The combined ILES configuration achieves an MAE reduction of 0.054°C . Since $0.054 < 0.035 + 0.044 = 0.079$, the combined gain is sub-additive, indicating that the two components share part of their effective contribution rather than synergizing. The manuscript text in Section 3.4 correctly identifies this as partial overlap. The authors should ensure that:

- (a) The interpretation of "complementarity" in the abstract, introduction, and ensemble motivation sections is consistent with this sub-additive result. Phrases such as "architecturally complementary" should be moderated to "partially complementary" or similar.
- (b) No claim of "synergistic interaction" appears in the manuscript or the supplementary material.

The ensemble approach is still supported by the fact that ILES outperforms all three individual configurations, but the strength of the complementarity claim should match the data.

2. SCOPE OF GENERALIZABILITY CLAIMS

The multi-site validation at M9474 and M9448 strengthens the manuscript, but all three stations lie within Jiangsu Province in the same temperate monsoon climate zone. The Conclusion acknowledges this. The abstract and introduction should be adjusted accordingly: phrases such as "transferable across different road environments" should be qualified as "transferable across different road environments within the temperate monsoon climate zone."

I appreciate the careful engagement with the previous round of comments and am willing to review the next version.