

Small typographic errors (missing punctuation or erroneous capitalization) that proofreaders should catch.

Data accessible, clearly described, easy to work with. This reviewer prefers .csv to .tab but that seems a matter of individual preference. I understand why authors might prefer CC-BY-NC but, due to proper ESSD cautions, have editors granted permission for -NC?

Overall: good well-organized description of QC levels and good summary of 'final' QC outcome, 0.15 ± 0.56 down to 0.00 ± 0.22 for temperature. In describing and summarizing these efforts and QC levels, the authors seem to have left out or passed over several issues.

Daytime vs nighttime much used but little described. Based on daily hours sunlight, calculated by day, month or season? Or calculated based on measured surface radiation values where night = low light = < some minimum value of W/m²?

Other parameters (RH, precip, wind) not corrected. Authors describe, correctly, the use of non-T parameters in various QC functions but otherwise give no hints about suitability, difficulty or desirability of addressing RH, precip, etc. Do readers await a future paper? Do we assume QC of T proved easier than other parameters? Authors give us no hint what to assume!

Authors should, technically, express offsets and SD in K rather than C. Not often done, I accept.

Authors have lumped 2 m data with 3-4 m data? Early mention but then no subsequent treatment. One suspects both sensor elevation and surrounding (mostly impervious) surfaces would have a large effect but never mentioned? Shadowing by anemometer mentioned occasionally but that occurs independently of short vs high poles and regardless of underlying surface?

UHI: This reader missed an overall assessment of data as QC'd here to address UHI. Do we need 0.1K? 1.0K? Have the authors come close with these corrections. In view of distance of reference AWS from Leuven and, for two RMIB stations at least, distance from true urban settings, do authors feel they have a network now suitable for addressing UHI. Not clear, perhaps needs/deserves further clarification. Given sensor height differences already mentioned plus apparent absence (or, avoidance) of the most urban land use categories, can users really trust this data for further UHI work? UHI mentioned frequently in introduction but not at all in conclusion paragraph. I agree with summary sentences but, if they could not in the end address UHI - which, in many indices, includes high net radiation, low RH and low wind - should they have given so much attention in introduction?