

The revised manuscript “High-resolution all-sky land surface temperature and net radiation over Europe” has been largely improved. However, there are still several concerns from my viewpoint.

1. In the response to my comment 1, authors explained that the land surface temperature (LST) data is an intermediate product and did not need accuracy assessment. However, the LST data has been shown in the title of the manuscript and described in the abstract. As a published dataset, the LST data should be reliable to be used. Otherwise, no need to be shown in the title.

2. In the response to my comment 4, authors think that a systematic review of existing LST datasets is not necessary. The ESSD journal focus on the novelty and description of the published datasets instead of the novelty of the method. Therefore, a solid description on existing datasets is very important to show the novelty of this study. I suggest authors highlight the novelty of their dataset by comparing with existing datasets. As I know, there are several other gap-less LST datasets covering the current study area (even larger areas). No needs for listing all the literature, but it is necessary to do discussion).

3. The authors are suggested to double check their descriptions. Examples of issues are listed as follows. 1) Lines 70 and 84, what does “??” mean? 2) Line 224, what does “nore details” mean? 3) Line 378, what does “the the Sentinel 3 LST...” mean?