Dear Andreas,

Thank you very much for your constructive comments that we will shortly address in the following.

After using the search function, we realised that we used "better" indeed quite often – in most of the cases in combination with model performance. We agree that this is not fully correct, but would defend the use in combination with performance due to a better readability. As we described the used model evaluation metrics in chapter 2.3.5, we would assume that the reader knows what we mean with "better performance" without the need to write in every sentence "better performance in terms of R^2 and RMSE" or something similar. Anyhow, we replaced some of the occurrences of "better performance" with the full description to remind the reader about the used metrics. For the cases related to data quality of a sensor, we agree that using "higher accuracy/precision/robustness/etc." is more appropriate than "better".

With respect to the other two comments, we changed the text as proposed by you.

Additionally, we changed the order of subfigures in the supplement for figures SF11, SF12, SF13 and SF14 according to Fig. 9 in the main manuscript as once suggested by one of the reviewers.

Finally, we would like to thank you for guiding us through the whole review process.

With kind regards,

Anne Schucknecht an behalf of all co-authors