

Editor

I have checked your revisions and response letter. The manuscript is as good as ready to be published, I just want to see one additional correction:

In the response letter and in the revised manuscript you claim that PEcAn can only optimise parameters 'before simulations' (based on a meta-analysis of data on those parameters). This is not correct. I have double-checked this with people that have been using PEcAN intensively and PEcAn can be used both for (1) parameter optimisation 'before' simulations, and for (2) parameter optimisation by minimizing a cost function (minimizing the difference between observed and simulated output variables), similar as the GLUE approach. I am perfectly fine with the GLUE approach that has been used in your study. So please just adapt the statement about PEcAn (line 600-602) in that sense (or remove the comparison with PEcAn here).

Re: Dear Editor, thank you so much for the quality control and pointing out our mistake. We have now removed the comparison between GLUE and PEcAn (Lines 600-603):

~~“Compared to other optimizers (such as PEcAn) that calibrates parameters using plant traits observations (e.g., wood density, leaf turnover rate) before running model simulations, GLUE’s ability of constraining parameters from model output variables utilizing observations of forest stand variables (BA, AGB, etc.) could further reduce the uncertainty of parameters (Wang et al. 2013).”~~

and corrected a citation (Line 218):

“Everham and Brokaw1996”