

The authors addressed the concerns raised in the previous review round and the manuscript can now be accepted subject to minor revisions.

In response to specific comments:

1. The authors state that the linear angular relationships ($\alpha = i\Delta\theta_h$ and $\chi = j\Delta\theta_v$) in Snee et al. (2023) are only correct for a curved lens. However, Snee et al. (2023) explicitly designed their framework for standard flat-sensor cameras operating under a pinhole camera model, but utilized these linear relationships as a simplified small angle approximation ($\tan \theta \approx \theta$) because the spatial distortion is typically minor at long focal distances. On what basis was this 2% error calculated? Is it the comparison between the method they used and the method of Snee et al. (2023)?

Moreover, what the authors have added around line 102 should also be added at lines 209-211. In particular, the field of view (demonstrated to be one of the main sources of error and uncertainty in the geometric calibration, e.g., <https://doi.org/10.3390/rs14071766>) and camera inclination (even if in their specific case is zero) are not listed here, but mentioned only afterwards (lines 253 and 265). Consider citing these parameters also at the beginning (lines 209-211) for clarity.

Apart from these details, the proposed revisions are satisfactory and contribute to improving the clarity of the manuscript.

Technical corrections:

- Line 34: as a previous sentence was removed, the authors may want to place the (Briggs 1969, 1975) citation here
- If ERA5 data are directly downloaded from cds.climate.copernicus.eu, a citation and attribution section is available in the right-hand panel when opening the dataset page (e.g., <https://doi.org/10.24381/cds.adbb2d47>)
- Supplementary Section S3 is repeated twice in the Supplementary Materials (the section with geometric transformations should be S4)