

Response to Reviewer #1

We thank the reviewer#1 for the insightful and detailed comments and suggestions, which helped to significantly improve the manuscript. The reviewer's comments are shown in *blue italics* with the author responses in black.

General comment:

Kou et al. estimated biosphere carbon fluxes over China by applying a regional inversion system to GOSAT CO₂ data. The inversion was designed to provide a higher spatialtemporal resolution than previous studies. While the topic is definitely interesting to the reader of ACP, the manuscript, in its current form, is not up to the standard. My main comments are as follows.

(1) The paper lacks technical rigor. The authors present the high spatial-temporal resolution (64 km and 1 hour) as the innovation of the paper, but do not provide justification that the inversion of GOSAT CO₂ data can meaningfully resolve hourly data, as GOSAT observations are daily observations at the same local solar time. A reader may be interested in quantitative information on to what extent the results are affected by prior information and to what extent they are constrained by observations. In addition, the authors claimed that the inversion is verified against "independent observations". But in fact these validation data are also taken from the same GOSAT CO₂ dataset. Although these observations are not assimilated in the inversion, they may well have error distributions similar to those assimilated. Hence, these data cannot be regarded as "independent" validation data.

Thank the review for the comment. First of all, measured CO₂ concentrations are the result of upstream surface fluxes and atmospheric transport process. Generally speaking, the longer in the past a flux event occurred, the smaller its impact will be on a given sample of air. Therefore, we choose an "assimilation window" to represent how far back in time we expect to be able to pinpoint a given flux signal from available measurements. In an assimilation cycle, the fluxes for the 24-h assimilation window have been designed to be optimized hour by hour successively in this study. Accordingly, the fluxes have been adjusted 24 times before generating posterior fluxes. Actually, in this study the NOAA operational EnKF system, which is an EnSRF and modified with the ensemble Kalman smoother (EnKS) feature, is further extended to jointly assimilate the CO₂ concentrations and fluxes to update

the flux and concentration fields, respectively. The EnKS allows for a sequential processing of the measurements in time, which updates the ensemble at prior times every time new observations are available. Thus, EnKS that can take into future observations into account is used to assimilate the concentrations and update the fluxes.

In this study, the state vector \mathbf{x} includes the mass concentration \mathbf{C} and the flux \mathbf{E} , i.e. $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{E}]^T$. Here, the state variables of mass concentration \mathbf{C} are the CO₂ concentrations. The ensemble forecast concentration fields of CO₂ are respectively used in calculating ensemble fluxes $\mathbf{E}_{i,t}^f$ as described in Section 2.2.1. The ensemble members of CO₂ concentration fields \mathbf{C}^f are forecasted using CMAQ, forced by the forecast emissions \mathbf{E}^f whose initial conditions are previously analyzed concentration fields. Now, the background of the joint vector, $\mathbf{x}^f = [\mathbf{C}^f, \mathbf{E}^f]^T$, has been produced. Then, the analyzed state vector, $\mathbf{x}^a = [\mathbf{C}^a, \mathbf{E}^a]^T$, is optimized by applying EnKS. The configurations of the EnKS were as follows: 1) ensemble size was set to 50; 2) the horizontal localization radius was 1280 km; 3) the covariance inflation factor β was set to 80; 4) the assimilation window in EnKS was set to 24 h (Peng et al., 2023). In addition, hour-by-hour assimilation was adopted attribute to the novel flux forecast model, fine-scale CMAQ forward hourly simulation output, as well as the available GOSAT observations at certain hour of the day. Therefore, in spite of the daily GOSAT observations at the same local solar time, the inversion of GOSAT CO₂ data can meaningfully resolve hourly data through the EnKS configuration.

Furthermore, readers may be interested in quantitative information on to what extent the results are affected by prior information and to what extent they are constrained by observations. Usually, it is hard to evaluate the optimized flux, because comparison with *in situ* flux measurements is difficult on account of the discrepancy in scales between assimilated fluxes in the model grid and eddy-covariance measurements over a very large uniform underlying surface. Nevertheless, the prior information has been embodied in *a priori* flux simulated concentrations, and observation information has been embodied in the *a posteriori* flux simulation, whose fluxes are constrained by observations. By evaluating the differences between these two sets of simulation results, the prior information and observation information now have access to be accessed quantitatively. Therefore, this traditional

approach was adopted as a compromise to assess whether the *a posteriori* fluxes would enable improvements in the fit to the observed CO₂ concentrations. The RMSEs of prior and posterior simulations (i.e. CTRL and FC) are further presented in Table R1 in the revised manuscript. According to the quantitative evaluation on RMSE, the observations have played a positive role in improving carbon sink over the model domain. At the site scale, some sites tend to systematically be poorly fitted by the inversions, in particular those in the vicinity of large urban areas with large anthropogenic emissions, such as Jinsha and Lin'an. Besides these two sites, the difference between CTRL and FC is affected by the observation information through assimilation ranges from 0.25% to 12.34% (i.e. RMSE decreasing rates), with an average of 2.48% among all surface observation sites. Moreover, smaller correlation coefficient improvement in the contrast of CTRL and FC imply that prior flux patterns play an important role in the CO₂ variation compared with that of posterior flux (Table 1).

In addition, although some GOSAT observations which are not assimilated in the inversion were used as independent data to evaluate the posterior flux, they may have error distributions similar to those assimilated. Therefore, surface *in situ* observations from 14 sites are further used as independent observations to evaluate the inversion result in the revised manuscript. Comparison between surface observations, prior flux simulation, posterior flux simulation and the analysis for hourly CO₂ concentration is added in Table R1. The modeled CO₂ concentrations were extracted from the simulated hourly CO₂ fields according to the locations, elevation, and time of each observation. The averages of observation, CTRL, FC, and AN over these 14 stations are 410.97, 413.01, 412.82, and 412.21 ppm, respectively. According to the statistics listed in Table R1, the statistics of the analytical field (AN) are better than FC and CTRL, including RMSE and MAE, which gives a direct indication that the assimilation performs well. Taking improvement as example, the RMSE improvement rate between the FC and CTRL mostly ranges from -2.13% to 12.34% with an average of 2.48%, and the MAE improvement rate ranges from 0.08% to 9.73% with an average of 2.37%. Further, although the RMSE and MAE of AN are lower than CTRL, those of FC are higher than CTRL in Lin'an and Jinsha. This could be attributed to the influence from human activities to a large extent (Liang et al., 2023), because Jinsha and Lin'an are both urban background stations for Central China (i.e. Jinsha locates in Wuhan, Hubei) and East China (i.e. Lin'an locates in Yangtze River Delta). Thus, this helps to check that the inversions actually improve the model fits to the observations but also to determine whether

Lin'an and Jinsha sites are particularly problematic for natural flux inversions.

We have modified the relevant parts in the revised manuscripts (Line 189–270, Line 595–615, and Line 500–535), and Table 4 is further added and discussed.

Table R1. Evaluation results between *in situ* observations and model, including CTRL (black, *a priori* flux simulation), FC (*italic, a posteriori* flux simulation), and AN (**bold**, analysis fields from JDAS).

	Lat.(°N)	OBS.	OBS.	RMSE	RMSE Imp. Rate	MAE	MAE Imp. Rate	General Site
	/Lon.(°E)	NUM	Freq.	(CTRL/FC/AN)	FC/AN (%)	(CTRL/FC/AN)	FC/AN (%)	Description
Longfengshan	44.73/127.60	840	Hourly	10.94/10.87/ 10.38	0.63/ 5.16	7.83/7.81/ 7.72	0.30/ 1.40	Forest (Northeast China)
Shangdianzi	40.65/117.12	1620	Hourly	10.00/9.87/ 9.74	1.34/ 2.58	6.87/6.62/ 6.64	3.53/ 3.26	Cropland (North China)
Mt. Waliguan	36.28/100.90	338	Daily	7.05/6.64/ 6.31	5.78/ 10.43	4.63/4.38/ 4.15	5.35/ 10.35	Tibet Plateau (China)
Shangri-La	28.00/99.40	1709	Hourly	9.76/9.62/ 9.44	1.42/ 3.21	7.21/7.08/ 7.02	1.72/ 2.61	Forest (Southeast China)
Lin'an	30.30/119.72	1410	Hourly	9.42/9.49/ 8.60	-0.73/ 8.70	6.63/6.78/ 6.14	-2.16/ 7.45	Forest (East China)
Jinsha	29.63/114.22	30	Weekly	9.21/9.41/ 8.94	-2.13/ 2.96	6.96/7.04/ 6.46	-1.15/ 7.13	Urban (Central China)
King's Park	22.31/114.17	364	Daily	22.12/21.63/ 21.10	2.22/ 4.63	17.02/16.68/ 16.06	1.98/ 5.06	Urban (Hong Kong, China)
Ulaan Uul	44.45/111.08	49	Weekly	5.50/5.41/ 5.22	1.62/ 5.06	3.70/3.63/ 3.52	2.02/ 5.09	Grassland (Mongolia)
Ryori	39.03/141.82	8553	Hourly	6.85/6.77/ 6.06	1.08/ 11.51	4.59/4.48/ 3.91	2.21/ 14.68	Mountain (Japan)
Mt. Dodaira	36.00/139.20	7928	Hourly	7.62/7.51/ 7.12	1.45/ 6.50	5.37/5.31/ 5.00	1.22/ 6.95	Mountain (Japan)
Kisai	36.08/139.55	8686	Hourly	17.09/15.90/ 15.80	6.99/ 7.56	13.00/12.22/ 12.24	5.99/ 5.83	Urban (Japan)
Anmyeon-do	36.53/126.32	3228	Hourly	16.00/14.03/ 13.81	12.34/ 13.70	10.42/9.41/ 8.85	9.73/ 15.06	Coastal (Korea)
Jeju Gosan	33.30/126.21	4373	Hourly	10.10/9.85/ 8.79	2.42/ 12.97	7.29/7.12/ 6.34	2.39/ 13.10	Ocean (Korea)
Yonagunijima	24.47/123.02	8085	Hourly	9.24/9.21/ 8.60	0.25/ 6.86	7.39/7.38/ 6.91	0.08/ 6.41	Ocean (Japan)
AVE				10.78/10.44/ 9.99	2.48/ 7.27	7.78/7.57/ 7.21	2.37/ 7.49	

Note. 'Lat./Lon.' refers to the latitude and longitude of site; 'OBS. NUM' refers to the observation amount; 'OBS. Freq.' refers to the observation time frequency; 'RMSE Imp. Rate' refers to the improvement rate of RMSE, i.e., $(RMSE_{CTRL}-RMSE_{FC})/RMSE_{CTRL}\times 100\%$ and $(RMSE_{CTRL}-RMSE_{AN})/RMSE_{CTRL}\times 100\%$; 'MAE Imp. Rate' refers to the improvement rate of MAE, i.e., $(MAE_{CTRL}-MAE_{FC})/MAE_{CTRL}\times 100\%$ and $(MAE_{CTRL}-MAE_{AN})/MAE_{CTRL}\times 100\%$, respectively. The annual averages were calculated from the hourly output.

Here are the above-mentioned references.

Liang, M., Zhang, Y., Ma, Q., L., Yu, D. J., Chen, X. J., & Cohen, J. B. (2023). Dramatic decline of observed atmospheric CO₂ and CH₄ during the COVID-19 lockdown over the Yangtze River Delta of China. *Journal of Environmental Sciences*, 124, 712–722, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jes.2021.09.034>

Peng, Z., Kou, X. X., Zhang, M. G., Lei, L. L., Miao, S. G., Wang, H. M., Jiang, F., Han, X., and Fang, S. X. (2023). CO₂ flux inversion with a regional joint data assimilation system based on CMAQ, EnKS, and surface observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmosphere*, 128, e2022JD037154. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JD037154>

(2) The writing needs to be improved. For example, Section 2.2 (a key section describing the inversion algorithm) is difficult to follow. The logic flow is not clear. Important information such as how the error covariance matrices are specified and updated in the ESRFs is missing. Results in Section 3.3-3.4 are not presented in a concise and well-structured way. The discussion is not focused on new findings and insight, but in many cases, reporting numbers without proper interpretation. There are several occurrences where some discussion points and even exact same sentences are repeated. For example, "(the system) is sufficient to robustly constrain the control vector" appears in line 26, 416, and 624. Notation and terminologies are used inconsistently and loosely, for instance, control vectors, state vector, and state variables are all used to represent a similar concept without explicit definitions. Overall, I'd suggest to substantially shorten the paper to focus on the contribution of this study to the field. Attention needs to be paid to logic flows and consistent terminology.

Thank the reviewer for the comment. First of all, Section 2.2 has been revised to describe the inversion algorithm. In the joint assimilation framework, besides the application of CMAQ to generate ensemble CO₂ concentrations, a flux forecast model was also designed to represent flux variations on account of fluxes acting as model forcing. The EnKS was further designed to joint assimilate CO₂ concentrations and fluxes. A brief description of the flux forecast model as well as the ensemble assimilation scheme is presented in Section 2.2. Consequently, after completing the "forecast step", Kalman gain matrix K is obtained by minimizing the analysis error covariance with evolved forecast error covariance over time. Then, the associated analyzed state variables, $\mathbf{x}^a = [\mathbf{C}^a, \mathbf{E}^a]^T$, can be updated by applying the EnKS constrained by GOSAT retrievals in the "analysis step". In addition, the distribution of ensemble spread of CO₂ flux in January 2016 is provided in Figure R1. It shows that the values of the ensemble spread ranges from 0.2 to 0.8 in most areas, which are consistent with our previous studies (Peng et al., 2015 in Figure 11c and Peng et al., 2023).

Furthermore, detailed modifications have been made in Section 3.3–3.4 as well as the full text to present in a concise and well-structured way. And we have separated the results and discussion in the revised manuscript. Repeated points and sentences have been carefully considered and revised. Moreover, the notation and terminologies are redefined clearly and revised to keep consistency. For instance, control vectors, state vectors, joint vectors and state variables are modified as state variables, which refers to the variables used to assimilation (i.e., $\mathbf{x} = [\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{E}]^T$).

We have modified the relevant parts in the revised manuscripts (Section 2, Section 3 and Section 4).




Figure R1. The ensemble spread of $\lambda_{i,t}^a$ at model level 1 in January 2016, when $\beta=80$.

Here are the above-mentioned references.

Peng, Z., Zhang, M. G., Kou, X. X., Tian, X. J., & Ma, X. G. (2015). A regional carbon flux data assimilation system and its preliminary evaluation in East Asia. *Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics*, 15, 1087–1104. <https://doi.org/10.5194/acp-15-1087-2015>.

Peng, Z., Kou, X. X., Zhang, M. G., Lei, L. L., Miao, S. G., Wang, H. M., Jiang, F., Han, X., and Fang, S. X. (2023). CO₂ flux inversion with a regional joint data assimilation system based on CMAQ, EnKS, and surface observations. *Journal of Geophysical Research-Atmosphere*, 128, e2022JD037154. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2022JD037154>

Minor comments:

Line 23, 228: What is an observational operator? It is never clearly defined.

Observation operator converts the background forecast to observation space. To obtain the simulated

observations $H(\mathbf{C}^f)$, observation operator performs the necessary interpolation and transformation from model 3D CO₂ concentrations forecast to observation space XCO₂. The simulated CO₂ concentration profiles were mapped into the satellite retrieval levels and then vertically integrated based on the satellite averaging kernel according to the Equation 2. In addition, for the $H(\mathbf{E}^f)$, it should be noted that observation operator includes not only interpolation (i.e. Equation 2) but also CMAQ simulation to convert from flux to simulated XCO₂.

We have modified the description of observation operator in the revised manuscripts (Line 235–250), and we hope we can make the meaning clear now.

Line 111-112. The author first claimed that "regional CTMs are rarely used in satellite carbon data assimilation" but then cite a few studies that performed regional carbon data assimilation, which appears to be inconsistent. Moreover, the authors need to clarify what are innovations in this study relative to these cited studies.

At present, almost all China's carbon sink inversions use global atmospheric transport models with a relatively coarse spatial resolution and long timescale from a weekly or monthly perspective. For instance, Huang and Zhang assimilated CO₂ observations with regional CTM to optimize the CO₂ concentration fields (Huang et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2021). In recent years, several studies have used regional CTMs in CO₂ flux inversions inferred from surface stations, towers, and aircraft flights. The potential use of regional CTM in CO₂ inversions with satellite has been explored with artificial retrievals by observing system simulation experiments. Thus, regional CTMs has been rarely used in real satellite carbon data inversion of China's terrestrial carbon sink, even though multi-model comparisons have reported large uncertainties introduced by global CTMs in estimating the carbon sink. Because of this, taking advantage of regional chemistry transport models for mesoscale simulation and spaceborne sensors for spatial coverage, the GOSAT XCO₂ retrievals were introduced in CMAQ and EnKS-based regional inversion system to constrain China's biosphere sink.

We are sorry about the confusion in the introduction. We have modified the abstract in the revised manuscript (Line 110–130), and the motivation and innovation has been rewritten in the introduction.

Line 140: The study uses historical GOSAT observations not "real-time" GOSAT observations.

Yes, this study uses historical GOSAT observations. The “real-time” statement has been modified in the revised text and we have checked the full text with the incorrect expression.

Line 150-154: Two science questions are raised by the end of the Introduction, but it is not apparent that the discussion is focused on these questions nor these questions are adequately addressed.

Yes, the reviewer makes a good point. Actually, this paper focuses on the following two questions:

1. On what scales can regional CTMs and GOSAT observations facilitate the inversion of China’s carbon sink?
2. What is the difference between posterior flux inferred from spaceborne retrievals and prior flux?

For Question 1, we try to discuss the posterior flux from country, regional to provincial scales, as well as daily, monthly, and annual variation. First of all, we found that the size of the assimilated biosphere sink in China was $-0.47 \text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$, which was comparable with previous results (i.e., -0.27 to $-0.68 \text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$). Furthermore, the seasonal patterns were recalibrated well, with a growing season that shifted earlier in the year over central and south China. We further investigated the condition of the biosphere carbon sink in several of China’s key ecological areas. Using Xishuangbanna (XS) as an example, the large transport model errors that were included in the model–data mismatch error involved in previous global inversion studies were effectively reduced by JDAS, and XS was reported to be a relatively stronger sink in contrast to prior estimates ($-10.79/-10.12 \text{ TgC yr}^{-1}$). Moreover, the provincial-scale biosphere flux was re-estimated, and the difference between the *a posteriori* and *a priori* flux ranged from $-7.03 \text{ TgC yr}^{-1}$ in Heilongjiang to 2.95 TgC yr^{-1} in Shandong.

For Question 2, considering our prior estimates from CT2019B, the discrepancy between posterior and prior flux could be because our study (a) relied on a fine-scale regional transport model; (b) was constrained by GOSAT XCO₂ retrievals with better spatial coverage rather than sparse and inhomogeneous *in situ* observations; (c) performed a joint assimilation of CO₂ flux and concentration, which helped reduce the uncertainty in both the initial CO₂ fields and the fluxes; and (d) carried out hourly assimilation based on hourly simulation and observation, which was more realistic. In addition,

we further assess the performance of the *a posteriori* CO₂ fluxes by comparing the CTRL, FC and AN concentration against independent observations. In addition, we further assess the performance of the *a posteriori* CO₂ fluxes by comparing the CTRL, FC and AN results against 14 surface in-situ observations sites. The averages of observation, CTRL, FC, and AN over these 14 stations are 410.97, 413.01, 412.82, and 412.21 ppm, respectively. According to the statistics listed in Table 4, the statistics of the analytical field (AN) are better than FC and CTRL, including RMSE and MAE, which gives a direct indication that the assimilation performs well. Taking improvement as example, the RMSE improvement rate between the FC and CTRL mostly ranges from 0.25% to 12.34% (besides two sites in the vicinity of large urban areas) with an average of 2.48%, and the MAE improvement rate ranges from 0.08% to 9.73% with an average of 2.37%.

We have rephrased the questions, address the questions, and modified the relevant parts in the revised manuscript.

Line 171: Why does not CMAQ need initial and lateral boundary meteorological fields. Is CMAQ coupled with a meteorology model (e.g., WRF)? A typical regional chemical transport model like CMAQ is driven by archived met fields and does not need initial and lateral boundary meteorological fields.

Thank the reviewer for the comment. The CO₂ concentration was forecast with the regional atmospheric chemistry transport model, CMAQ, coupled with the RAMS for providing the meteorological fields. On one hand, CMAQ, a regional CTM, needs initial and boundary CO₂ concentrations fields, which is extracted from CT2019B concentration products (3° × 2°, 3h, globally). On the other hand, CMAQ is coupled with a regional meteorology model (i. e., RAMS), and CMAQ is driven by archived meteorological fields from RAMS. RAMS provides the three-dimensional meteorological fields in same horizontal resolution with CMAQ, with the lowest seven layers being the same as those in CMAQ. Consequently, RAMS need initial and boundary meteorological fields. In this study, the initial and lateral boundary meteorological fields, sea surface temperatures, and initial soil conditions were prescribed by European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts reanalysis data with a spatial resolution of 1° × 1° and 6-hourly temporal intervals.

We have modified the relevant parts of the revised manuscript (Line 165–190); please check if it is clear now.

Line 174: What is "real" initial and lateral boundary atmospheric CO₂ concentrations"?

Considering the unique characteristics (e.g., long atmospheric lifetime, large background concentration, and strong biosphere–atmosphere exchanges) of atmospheric CO₂ that are distinctly different from other traditionally modeled chemical pollutants, some key requirements for regional CO₂ modeling have been noted, such as using realistic initial and lateral boundary conditions (Kou et al., 2015). In this study, the initial fields and boundary conditions of atmospheric CO₂ volume fraction were obtained by interpolation of NOAA’s CT2019B (3° × 2°, 3h, globally). CT2019B is a widely recognized product, whose global CO₂ concentrations were created using the optimized surface fluxes and simulated atmospheric transport of CarbonTracker. CT2019B could represent the optimum estimate of the global distribution of atmospheric CO₂ (Jacobson et al., 2020).

We have modified the relevant parts of the revised manuscript (Line 167–171).

Line 232: If y_f and y_p are "wet" CO₂ concentration, you should apply $(1-w)^{-1}$ to convert "wet" concentration to "dry" concentration, instead of multiplying $(1-w)$

Thank the reviewer for the comment. We’re sorry about the mistake in typing the formula. Actually, we applied $(1-w)^{-1}$ to convert “wet” concentrations to “dry” concentration, as suggested by Feng et al. (2009). We have modified the formula in the revised manuscript (Line 241).

Line 245: What is BG here?

BG denotes the model’s first guess background fields \mathbf{x}^f in the assimilation scheme. The background of the state variables, $\mathbf{x}^f = [\mathbf{C}^f, \mathbf{E}^f]^T$, can be prepared by CMAQ and flux forecast model, where \mathbf{C} represents CO₂ concentration from CMAQ simulation and \mathbf{E} represents the CO₂ flux from the CO₂ flux forecast model. We have modified the relevant parts of the revised manuscript (Line 257–261).

Line 265: model grid -> model grid point

Yes, we have modified “model grid” as “model grid point”, and we have checked the full text with the incorrect expression.

Line 271-274: It is not well justified that data with $|o-b|>5$ ppm should be removed. How the choice of the threshold affects the inversion results?

OMB (i.e., *o-b*, observation-minus-background) quality control method is based on the observation increments, which is used to check the background fields and adopted by many assimilation systems. In the EnKS assimilation scheme, the analysis \mathbf{x}^a is obtained by adding the innovations to the model forecast with weights \mathbf{K} (i.e. Kalman gain matrix), that are determined based on the estimated statistical error covariance of the forecast and the observations. Particularly, \mathbf{K} is obtained by minimizing the analysis error covariance with evolved forecast error covariance over time. In this study, the records with absolute biases (i.e., $|o - b|$) between the observation and background simulations greater than 5 ppm were removed, which are considered to have a lack of regional representativeness (Peng et al., 2023). Due to the spatial resolution (64×64 km) of our model, we cannot reproduce such observations. Moreover, the scenario of $|o - b| > 5.00$ was mostly found near the boundary of the model domain.

We have modified the relevant parts of the revised manuscript (Line 289–294).

Line 281: Non-assimilated observations cannot be regarded as independent verification data. The filtering criteria (1) and (3) are the same as that for assimilated observations, and I don't quite get what the criteria (2) is about.

Thank the reviewer for the comment. The assimilated and non-assimilated GOSAT XCO₂ observations are selected by different process of sifting (Table R2). These two sets of observations both used XCO₂ with “outcome_flag = 1” and precluded absolute biases between the observation and simulations greater than 5 ppm. Nevertheless, the main difference lies in step 2. The XCO₂ with the minimum “xco₂_uncert” in the same model grid point at the same hour were used to assimilate, and other XCO₂ were used to validate.

Although some GOSAT observations which are not assimilated in the inversion were used to evaluate the posterior flux, they may have error distributions similar to those assimilated. Therefore, surface *in situ* observations from 14 sites are further used as independent observations to evaluate the inversion result in the revised manuscript. Comparison between surface observations, prior flux simulation, posterior flux simulation and the analysis for hourly CO₂ concentration is added in Table R1. According to the statistics listed in Table R1, the statistics of the analytical field (AN) are better than FC and CTRL, including RMSE and MAE, which gives a direct indication that the assimilation performs well. Taking improvement as example, the RMSE improvement rate between the FC and CTRL mostly ranges from -2.13% to 12.34% with an average of 2.48%, and the MAE improvement rate ranges from 0.08% to 9.73% with an average of 2.37%.

We have modified the relevant parts (Line 282–300), and Table 4 is further added and discussed in the revised manuscripts.

Table R2 GOSAT XCO₂ for assimilation and validation

	XCO ₂ for assimilation	XCO ₂ for validation
Step 1	Select XCO ₂ with “outcome_flag = 1”,	Select XCO ₂ with “outcome_flag = 1”,
Step 2	Select XCO ₂ with the minimum “xco2_uncert” in the same model grid point at the same hour	Select XCO ₂ except for values minimum “xco2_uncert”, in order to filter out all of the assimilated XCO ₂
Step 3	Preclude record with absolute biases between the observation and simulations greater than 5 ppm	Preclude record with absolute biases between the observation and simulations greater than 5 ppm

Line 293: Natural fluxes are optimized/updated, not "assimilated"

Yes, we have modified “assimilated” as “optimized”, and we have checked the full text with the incorrect expression.

Line 302-304: It is unclear whether boundary conditions are perturbed by 5% or 10%. More importantly, it is not justified whether 10% perturbation to natural fluxes is proper.

The initial and boundary conditions are perturbed by adding Gaussian random noise with a standard deviation of 5%.

After completing the “forecast step” with the flux forecast model and CMAQ, Kalman gain matrix K is obtained by minimizing the analysis error covariance with evolved forecast error covariance over time. Then, the associated analyzed state variables, $\mathbf{x}^a = [\mathbf{C}^a, \mathbf{E}^a]^T$, can be updated by applying the EnKS constrained by GOSAT retrievals in the “analysis step”. In addition, the distribution of ensemble spread of CO₂ flux in January 2016 is provided in Figure R1. It shows that the values of the ensemble spread ranges from 0.2 to 0.8 in most areas, which are consistent with our previous studies (Peng et al., 2015 in Figure 11c and Peng et al., 2023).

We have modified the description of the inversion algorithm in Section 2.2 (Line 310–315).

Line 312: The word "high-risk" may not be suitable here.

Yes, we have modified the expression. This traditional approach was adopted as a compromise to assess whether the *a posteriori* fluxes would enable improvements in the fit to the observed CO₂ concentrations. Fit to the observed CO₂ concentrations was analyzed with posterior and prior flux simulation, respectively. The aims are to check that inversions actually improve the model fits to the observations, which is a basic diagnostic of atmospheric inversions.

We have modified the expressions in the revised manuscript (Line 323–327).

Line 325-334. Discussion on data coverage here is not related to either what is before or after. I do not see the flow of logic here.

Thank the reviewer for the comment. We have substantially revised the paper to focus on the contribution of this study to the field. Attentions have also been paid to logic flows.

Line 351: It is stated that the detector on GOSAT is "more sensitive to near-surface CO2 changes", but I don't know what this is compared to. And I do not see how this statement add to the discussion above.

The shortwave near-infrared detectors mounted on GOSAT have been testified as being more sensitive to near-surface CO₂ changes, which is compared to the thermal infrared detectors such as AIRS, the Atmospheric Infrared Sounder on NASA's Aqua satellite. Because this statement was not closely related to the contribution of this study, we have deleted this statement from the text, and we have checked the full text with the logic flows.

Line 373: I do not find any solid analysis showing that the calculation is reasonable or effective, except for some vague descriptions and comparisons.

We are sorry about the overstatement "the flux analysis increments are reasonably and effectively calculated". At present, Section 3.1 focused on describing the pattern of observation and analysis increments. In Section 3.5, fit to the observed CO₂ concentrations was analyzed with posterior and prior flux simulation, respectively. The aims are to check that inversions actually improve the model fits to the observations, which is a basic diagnostic of atmospheric inversions. This statement has been deleted from the text and we have checked the full text with the overstatements and logic flows.

Line 413-414: Logically, agreement with previous estimates does not provide a strong indication that your model transport is reliable.

Thank the reviewer for the comment. Logically, agreement with previous estimates does not provide a strong indication that our model transport is reliable. However, the comparison aims at producing a collective assessment of the net carbon flux between the terrestrial ecosystems and the atmosphere in China. It aims in particular at investigating the capacity of the inversions to deliver consistent flux estimates at the country scale. The inversion systems differ by the transport model, the inversion approach, the choice of observation and prior constraints, enabling us to facilitate the international comparison and mutual recognition.

We have modified the relevant parts in the revised manuscript (Line 360–390).

Line 471-472: I do not find results to support this claim.

We are sorry about the overstatement "This indicates that the regional carbon assimilation system is calibrated well and performs reliably". This statement has been deleted from the text and we have

checked the full text with the overstatements.

Line 489: Any evidence shows that a smaller daily variation is "more realistic"? I doubt whether the GOSAT data are sufficient to constrain the day-to-day variation given missing data and sparse sampling?

We are sorry about the overstatement "which appears more realistic than that of the *a priori* estimates". First of all, the smoothing window of the flux forecast model was set as 4 days (Equation 1). This implies that not only useful observational information from the previous assimilation cycle has been made beneficial to the next assimilation cycle, but also the background error covariance matrix of our inversion system is flow dependent. Furthermore, observation at the current time has been designed to update fluxes from the previous 24 hours through EnKS assimilation scheme. Therefore, the assimilation system can fully absorb the existing observational information and optimize the prior flux to some extent.

At present, Section 3.3 focused on describing the regional characteristics of posterior fluxes. In Section 3.5, fit to the observed CO₂ concentrations was analyzed with posterior and prior flux simulation, which is a basic diagnostic of atmospheric inversions. Inversions actually improve the model fits to the hourly and daily observations (except for two sites with weekly observation).

This statement has been deleted from the text and we have checked the full text with the overstatements and logic flows.

Line 391: Where does the number -0.47 come from?

The size of the biosphere carbon sink in China amounted to $-0.47 \text{ PgC yr}^{-1}$ from JDAS with GOSAT constraints in this study. We have modified the relevant parts in the revised manuscript (Line 370–375).

Section 3.3. The author found downward correction over forest and grassland and upward correction for cropland areas. This is an interesting finding, but no further information is presented.

Thank the reviewer for the comment. Generally, the *a priori* biosphere fluxes are overestimated ($\sim 0.1\text{--}0.3 \mu\text{mole m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$) in the north (dominated by forest, grassland and cropland) and south (dominated by

forest and grassland) of China, while they are underestimated ($\sim 0.1\text{--}0.5 \mu\text{mole m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$) primarily in central China where there is a large area of cropland (He et al., 2022). Fit to the observed CO_2 concentrations was analyzed with posterior and prior flux simulation, which is a basic diagnostic of atmospheric inversions. Inversions actually improve the model fits to the surface observations in forest areas (in Northeast, East and Southeast China), cropland areas (in North China), grassland areas (in Mongolia), Ocean (in Korea and Japan) and coastal areas (in Korea). Thus, downward correction over forest and grassland and upward correction for cropland areas has been evaluated against independent data.

We have modified the relevant parts in the revised manuscript with further information presented (Line 550–615).