Dear Dr. Murray Hamilton,

We are very grateful for your polite comments and suggestion to our manuscript. We have revised our manuscript in accordance with your suggestion.
The answers to the comments are as follows.

1.

In your response to Reviewer 1, where you have modified section 3.1, this is rather difficult to read. The added text would be much easier for the reader to assimilate if it were presented as a table. Further the remainder of this section is not in an acceptable format/style, where nearly every sentence is its own paragraph.

->
Thank you for your advice.
I added Table 4, and revised section 3.1 format/style.

2.

You have added the following sentence to the abstract;
"Although the use of visual inspection of clouds as a standard for judging is not practical for screening a full satellite data set, it has the advantage of allowing for locally optimized thresholds, while CLAUDIA1+3 use common global thresholds."
The first half, up to the comma, is a reasonable response to reviewer 1. But I don't know what you mean after the comma. The whole paper appears to be a comparison of CLAUDIA1 with CLAUDIA3, using visual inspection of a subset pixels to decide on the relative amounts of overlook and overestimate. If it is about using the visual inspection to set local thresholds then the added sentence seems self-contradictory. I'm sure that you didn't mean this to be contradictory, but then why add the second half of this sentence?

->
Thank you for your question.
The human eyes can recognize the objects by optimized thresholds for every attention area. On the other hand, CLAUDIA1+3 use common global thresholds. Therefore, cloud discrimination accuracy of visual inspection is greater than that of CLAUDIA1+3. In other words, visual inspection results can be used as truth data for accuracy evaluation of CLAUDIA1+3.

3.

Reviewer 2 made the comment that the language of the paper needs to be tightened up. I agree with this and the above comments are examples of why I think so. You have not actually addressed this reviewer comment.

Thus I regret to say that I cannot accept this paper in its present form for publication in AMT. The science in this paper is very good and I recommend that the paper be rewritten, with careful attention to style, and especially to the meaning of the words used. By and large the grammar in the paper is excellent, though there are one or two obviously missing words that a careful proof reading by a native English speaker would pick up.

->

Thank you for your indication.

Can I ask you for something? You are right that we are not native English speakers. But our manuscript has been professionally edited by a native speaker of ThinkSCIENCE K. K., which is a company specializing in providing editing, proofreading and translation services in all fields of science. If you indicate modified sections, such as section 3.1, we ordered English editing of section 3.1 to the ThinkSCIENCE K. K. again.

Please address all correspondence to:

Yu Oishi, PhD

Department of Planning and Coordination, Headquarter,

National Agriculture and Food Research Organization,

3-1-1 Kannondai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8517, Japan.

Tel.: +81-29-838-6756, E-mail: oishi.yu@affrc.go.jp

Yours sincerely,

Yu Oishi