

Reviewer: 2

For final publication, the manuscript should be reconsidered after major revisions. I would be willing to review the revised paper, if the editor considers it necessary. For final publication, the manuscript should be accepted subject to technical corrections

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection (will be published if the paper is accepted for final publication)

I appreciate the authors' additional revisions here. I think it really improves the clarity and utility of the study. I have a couple of tiny comments which could be addressed during the final file upload, but don't feel it rises to the level of another formal review process. So my personal opinion is to accept pending technical corrections as follows:

I would delete the sentence on lines 437-440 about autocorrelation magnitude, since the wording doesn't quite make sense/is potentially misleading, and I don't think the sentence is necessary.

Response: We have deleted the sentence in the revision.

The paper cited as Sayer et al (2015) was published in 2014.

Response: We have corrected it in the revision.

The 'Temporal Resolution' column in table 1 is not necessary (same value for all data sets, and mentioned in the text that it's monthly). So it can be deleted to make the table simpler to read.

Response: We have deleted the 'Temporal Resolution' column in the revision.

Tables 4, 5: As noted earlier I caution against over-emphasising p-values. Rather than denote both 95% and 90% significant results here, I'd just focus on one (maybe 95%) and remove the annotation for the other one. This will also keep things simpler. Most results significant at 90% also seem to be significant at the 95% level anyway.

Response: We have removed the annotations in Tables 4-5 according to your suggestions in the revision.