Dear Dr. Murray Hamilton,

We are very grateful for your polite suggestion to our manuscript and detailed explanation of our missing words. We have carefully revised the manuscript in accordance with your advices, and highlighted them with yellow markers.

Reply to comments:
1.

To indicate what I meant by missing words, I attach a copy of part of version 4 of the manuscript where the missing words that I spotted in a cursory reading are indicated with blue marks, along with one or two other grammatical errors. These are relatively minor, but ought to have been picked up by the company that you employ to do the proofreading. In any case, the copy editors of the publisher would also pick these up, so I am not really very concerned with them. (Please ignore the green marks, and the yellow marks pertain to what I've written below.)

->
Thank you for your polite suggestion.
We revised them.

2.

However I should add that I would not expect a company that provides proof reading services to employ people who can pick up parts of a text that are technically correct English, but fail to convey the intended meaning. Guidance on writing style, combined with a detailed knowledge of the subject, to help eliminate ambiguity becomes very useful, but unfortunately is difficult to find.

->

Thank you for your advice.
We were helped out a lot thanks for your polite indications.

3.

In your latest response you state
"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."
The last sentence says it all! This statement actually says explicitly what you are trying to achieve in this work. However I cannot find a clear, explicit statement like this in the manuscript itself. This is why the first referee, formed the impression that you were advocating to inspect visually each pixel of every image. This is really the critical failing of the manuscript.

Be careful though, because I think that the first referee is correct is questioning the actual accuracy of visual inspection. Statements like "optimised thresholds" and "discrimination accuracy of visual inspection" imply something quantitative about the visual inspection process that is unwarranted, at least without backup from the psycho-physics literature on human vision. To simply say that you visually inspect a subset of pixels to see if they are in fact cloudy is reasonable, however. While people would rightly question your ability to quantitatively judge the amount of cloud by eye, it is perfectly valid and useful to say that, visually, there is cloud (or is not).

->
Thank you very much for your detailed explanation.
We added "In other words, visual inspection results can be used as truth data for accuracy evaluation of CLAUDIA1+3."

4.
There are three places that it seems to me that you can make this aspect of the work clearer; first is in the abstract, second at the end of section 1, and third in section 2.4, where you should emphasise that you only inspect 1600 pixels of each image.

->
Thank you for your suggestion.
We added "(400 x 400 pixels)" in the abstract, section1, and section 2.4.

5.
Your new table 4 certainly improves the readability, but I'm at a loss to understand why you have kept all that highlighted text in section 3.1, much of which just repeats the information that is in table 4. To be sure, some of the sentences there summarise parts of the table, but the numbers in the text are just repetitious and continue to make the section hard to read.
The second half of section 3.1 is greatly improved however.

Thank you for your suggestion.

We removed the numbers in the text.

your sincerely,

Yu OISHI