

Our Response to the Editor's Comments

Comments to the Author:

Dear authors,

Thank you for providing your revised manuscript and your thorough response to reviews.

I have two minor revisions I would like to suggest:

-I'd like to encourage you to broaden your last paragraph, either by revising it or by adding a few more lines. It seems like the issue of small sample size is a general problem faced in all of this type of work. Beyond just pointing to this as a limitation of this study, I'd encourage you to add a few words to describe the greater problem faced by studies such as yours in terms of sample size. This is somewhat alluded to in the first few lines of that paragraph, but I'd encourage you to really make this point more generally in this paragraph.

RESPONSE: We appreciate this comment. We have revised the last paragraph and pointed out that the small lake sample size is a general issue for similar studies that evaluate the performances of multiple satellite missions.

-On line 652, you state that 12 lakes represents the "largest sample size", but did not contextualize what was meant by this. Could you include additional references here and give a little more context in terms of what you are comparing to?

RESPONSE: Following this suggestion, in the revised manuscript, we have added a description on the lake sample size in previous similar studies as a comparison, to clarify the confusion.

I'd also encourage one last thorough read for small grammatical errors.

RESPONSE: We thank the editor for the very careful reading. We have done another round of thorough read of this manuscript and corrected the grammatical errors that we can identify.

I look forward to reviewing your updated manuscript.

Christa