

## Responses to Editor

### Point #1

Dear Qichun and co-authors,

Based on your responses and the carefully revised manuscript, I am pleased to accept your paper for publication pending some minor technical correction.

**Response: We greatly appreciate the editor's efforts in handling our submission during this challenging time. We followed your suggestions and improved the manuscript accordingly.**

### Point #2

Line 169: the second 0.49 should be changed to 0.52. In your Track Changes version, I see 0.5 replacing 0.49.

**Response: We changed the value to 0.52 (now in Line 161).**

### Point #3

Line 228:  $t$  should be in italic

**Response: We italicized the letter  $t$  (now in Line 218).**

### Point #4

Figure 5: needs to be referred in the main text. It seems you missed to mention Figure 5 somewhere in Lines 336-340.

**Response: We cited the figure (Figure 5) in the text (now in line 317).**

### Point #5

Figure 8: caption can be rephrased. I suggest: (a) Correlation coefficients between calibrated forecasts and observations, and (b) improvements in correlation coefficients through the calibration with the BJP-ti model relative to that with the BJP model

**Response: We improved the figure caption based on your suggestions (now in lines 343-345).**

Point #6

Congratulations and thank you for contributing to HESS!

Yi He, HESS Editor

**Response: We really appreciate your time and constructive comments. The work has been significantly improved through the review process. Thank you again for giving us this chance to introduce our work to the HESS audience. We hope the methodology developed through this study and the implications derived from the discussions will contribute to enhancing future  $ET_0$  forecasting!**