

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We sincerely thank the editor and the two anonymous reviewers for their careful evaluation of our manuscript and for providing constructive and insightful comments. We greatly appreciate the time and effort they devoted to reviewing our work. The comments were extremely helpful for improving the clarity, balance, and scientific focus of our manuscript.

In response to the reviewers' comments, we have substantially revised the manuscript. The major revisions include: (1) reframing the study as intermittent multi-year observations rather than continuous long-term measurements; (2) revising the title, objectives, Results, Discussion, and Summary and conclusions to emphasize methodological insights, uncertainties, and limitations; (3) clarifying the sampling schedule and treatment of missing data within the daytime sampling window; (4) revising the drone-related sections to describe the measurements as supplemental and exploratory rather than fully integrated with the study or used for validation; (5) expanding the MEGAN Methods section to clarify the model calculation period, activity factor settings, and their pairing with observations; and (6) revising the Supplementary Materials, including figure and table captions, to clarify that the statistics are based on available daytime samples under intermittent sampling conditions.

Below, we provide point-by-point responses to each comment. The reviewers' comments are reproduced in italics, followed by our responses. Changes in the revised manuscript are indicated in the marked-up version, and a clean revised manuscript and revised Supplementary Materials are also provided.