

**General Comments:**

The authors have provided a thorough, clear, and well-organized response to all comments raised during the first round of review. The revised manuscript has been substantially improved, and the changes made appropriately address the reviewers' concerns. In particular, the additional explanations and revisions have enhanced the clarity, methodological transparency, and overall quality of the study.

After carefully examining the revised version, I find that only one minor issue remains that requires clarification or small revision, as detailed below. This issue does not affect the main conclusions of the paper and can be readily addressed without further analysis.

Therefore, I recommend acceptance after minor revision.

**Specific Comments:**

Regardless of the data source, when the same set of observations is used as reference, the RMSE is generally expected to be larger than the corresponding mean bias (MB), since RMSE incorporates both systematic and random errors. This should hold consistently for the proposed method, the baseline method, and the reanalysis products when evaluated against the same observations.

However, the results presented in the revised manuscript appear to violate this basic relationship in some cases. I therefore suggest that the authors carefully re-examine the calculation and presentation of the RMSE and MB, including the definitions, units, and averaging procedures, to ensure consistency and correctness.