

Response to Editor's comments (EC#1)

Responses to the editor's comments is provided below. The comments are in black gothic type, and responses are in blue type.

26 Jun 2023

Editor Comment #1

Citation: <https://doi.org/10.5194/essd-2023-116-EC1>

I would like to take a moment and thank the reviewers for their work. There are a lot of good comments, which I would like to encourage the authors to respond to and then to prepare a revised submission.

In general, I believe that the manuscript would benefit from careful incorporation of the reviewers' comments.

Additionally, I would like to encourage the authors to:

- include the GC-net stations in figure 1, to show how this gap has been closed

[We will revise as following the comment.](#)

- clearly distinguish in the manuscript between measured and derived parameters

[The observed values are summarized in Table 1, and the other parameters are derived parameters. If the distinction is made in the table, it would be more unclear, so we will revise the text to clearly state that "the observed values are summarized in Table 1 and the other parameters are derived parameters.](#)

- consider publishing the processing code to increase confidence in the dataset.

[As stated in our response to RC3's General comment, we will consider it positively and would prefer to publish it.](#)