Comment: If authors utilize codes to automatically complete the validation process for the data, I recommend that they validate all watersheds instead of just 21 selected watersheds. It would be beneficial if the author includes the evaluation reports either as an attachment or within the provided dataset. Additionally, if the authors used the codes for validation, it would be good for them to make it publicly accessible for future use by users and for local validation purposes. If the validation part relies on manual efforts, please disregard the previous suggestions. I highly appreciate the authors' revisions, as they have effectively addressed the majority of my concerns.

Response: The reviewer makes an excellent point. However, we did not use code to validate the process but instead manually interrogated the spatial data and calculated the performance metrics in a spreadsheet prior to reporting the metrics (e.g., Table 3). Creating publicly available code would greatly speed up the process and allow for a greater number of watersheds to be assessed; we will consider that high on our to-do list in subsequent research.