

## **Review of egusphere-2025-379 version 2**

### **Extension of AVHRR-based climate data records: Exploring ways to simulate AVHRR radiances from Suomi-NPP VIIRS data**

By: Karl-Göran Karlsson, Nina Håkansson, Salomon Eliasson, Erwin Wolters, Ronald Scheirer

#### **Overall Recommendation**

The authors did an excellent job in revising version 1 of their paper, they clearly replied to all my points of criticism and modified the manuscript accordingly. The revised version improved a lot, both in terms of information content and clarity, as well as in the presentation of the information.

I have found a few minor points of concern, which I mention below. Apart from these points, the manuscript is suitable for publication as far as I am concerned.

#### **Minor Criticisms**

*Table 7, 8, 9:* The authors give a very extensive reply to my question on the differences seen in validation results of the CFC results for COT>0.0 and COT >0.2 and the CTH results for COT >0.0 and COT>0.4. The basic message of my comment was: Why do the authors keep in the results of the COT>0.0, and not only present the CFC results for COT>0.2 and CTH results for COT>0.4?

I am happy with the reply of the authors, and it is fine to keep both. However, the differences between the results of COT>0.0 and COT>0.2 or 0.4 may raise many questions among readers. Thus, some additional explanation in the text would be helpful, can the authors add the main message of their reply, in a condensed form, as explanatory text to the results of Table 7, 8, 9?

*Table 6:* A % sign is missing

*Table B1:* The updates made to the tables in Appendix B are great, they make the picture complete. I noticed that the text of caption does not yet match with the updated content of the table (eg it mentions RMSE and does not mention CORRELATION). Please check and adjust