

Dear Dr. Paul Stoy:

Thank you, and Referee 3, for your continued feedback on our manuscript. We have revised the manuscript based on the Referee 3's suggestions. We added a paragraph about the limitations of our NDVI values to lines 163—168. We also tried to simplify the language throughout including the specific passages mentioned by the reviewer (*e.g.*, lines 6; 8—10; 20; 84; 87; 289—291; 297-298; 325—326; 349—350; 374—376). We also changed “noise” to “erroneous data” on line 158; and added “at the time of writing” to the PhenoCam site-year number on line 55. We did not change “continental” to either of the other two words suggested by the reviewer as this is the word used in the GOES R Series Product Definition and Users' Guide for the used CONUS product. We also did not change our text about the spatial averaging of the red pixels when calculating NDVI. Because we are aggregating the raw red data to the same scale as the raw NIR, which is a linear operation, before calculating NDVI (which is a nonlinear operation) there is no violation of Jensen's Inequality. Indeed, the approach suggested by Referee 3 (calculate NDVI at the red-pixel scale using the non-disaggregated NIR) is the violation of Jensen's because the later aggregation of these 4 NDVI values would involve averaging a nonlinear transform (the NDVI calculation). We appreciate your consideration of our manuscript for publication.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Wheeler