

I have read the revised paper of Naudts et al. with great interest. I repeat here that the authors present an impressive amount of model development work and succeed to present this complex effort in a clear and transparent way. The manuscript is lengthy, but it is important that a model description paper of this kind is complete and consistent. I therefore agree with the answer that the authors replied to Comment 1 of reviewer 1 about this issue.

I appreciate the efforts that the authors made to revise the manuscript. (Although I was sometimes confused by the line numbers indicated in the response letter...). I especially appreciate the efforts to expand the validation with extra model simulations, figures and table, which make the manuscript much stronger. And in addition, the revision of the parameterization section (which was my major comment to the previous version) is now much more clear and transparent and makes the work more reproducible.

Altogether, I am very happy with the efforts made by the authors to revise the manuscript. It resulted in an honest model description paper of high quality that is of great relevance for the entire land surface modelling community. I recommend this quality manuscript for publication.

Minor comments

- Line 921: of Luyssaert et al. (2007)
- In the response letter the authors claim that they adapted the sentence 'PFTs have no meaning outside the modelling community...', but this sentence still appears in its original formulation in the conclusions of the revised manuscript.