

1 General comments

The authors have substantiated their discussion section, but it appears they focused on adding a short review of literature material. The authors have added some site-specific arguments as well, but I would have preferred if they had gone further in discussing the energy balance components for their site (instead of referring to the literature). However, since the paper is now focused on comparing the WB versus EC method (despite only for one site) I think it could be published.

Principal criteria	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
Scientific significance		×		
Scientific quality		×		
Presentation quality		×		

2 Specific comments

2.1 Main questions

1. Partly mitigated in the new version.
2. Clear. But I would prefer to see the semi-variogram instead of believing the authors on their word. I think the authors could have also added a line about this in the revised document.
3. I think the authors could have used this in the Discussion section.

2.2 Minor questions

4. 6789/20: Clear.
5. 6786/16: Improved in text.
6. In the Discussion section I couldn't find how much would the small terms would matter for their study site. It is okay to cite other studies, but the authors could have made a quick estimate for their site (based on literature for similar sites) for the OP during the growing season.
7. Ok

8. Ok
9. Ok
10. Ok

3 Technical corrections etc

3.1 References

11. **The authors made some corrections but there are still some missing et al's for papers with multiple authors.** E.g. lines 77, 81, 84 (maybe some more, please check). Also Mauder. M 2011 should become Mauder and Foken 2011.

3.2 New corrections

1. L129: **has** a gently sloping landscape
2. L173: units should be Roman, not italic.
3. L231 “we used the average footprint weighted based on the frequency”: sound gibberish to me
4. L137: please use a degrees symbol instead of a 0 superscript
5. L320: of
6. L341: the minus should be on the next line