

Dear topical editor,

Thanks for reviewing our manuscript. Here the responses from your comment:

1) First, I would like to refer to the ethical issue mentioned by Reviewer 2.

I carefully reviewed the ethical guidelines of GMD and Copernicus, and the issue of 'helicopter research' is not addressed anywhere. I also consulted about the topic with the Chief Editor and we agree in that this is a topic that has not been discussed as an ethical issue for the journal or Copernicus. So, I cannot follow the advice of reviewer 2 to reject the manuscript based on this ethical consideration. We do not have an explicit policy for these cases.

Nevertheless, I think Reviewer 2 makes a valid point, and I would agree in that this manuscript could have benefitted from insights of local scientists that are familiar with the ecology of the African continent. However, for global or continental scale research, it is practically impossible to include scientists from all studied regions or countries.

My advice on this topic is simply to take these ethical considerations into account for future research, and see how local knowledge can be incorporated in large-scale analyses.

Indeed, we should better take into account this aspect of our works. We will be more inclusive in our future researches.

2) Reviewer 2 was correct regarding the use of the point symbol for separating decimal places. I guess I made the wrong suggestion in a previous round, and I apologize for it, but you were using inconsistent notation in the first place and continue doing so in this version (e.g. line 543). The correct separation symbol for the English language and in scientific publications is the point, e.g. 2.5 or 1.01. Please change this in all your figures, tables and text and be consistent.

All the commas have been transformed in point in figures, tables and text.

3) Line 193. Equation notation is inconsistent with referenced equations.

Yes, you are right there was a mismatch between two revisions of mine. I rewrite equation 2 and 3 in order to retrieve the logical flow this section.

4) Lines 296-297. 'Confident' and 'Credible' intervals are still used inconsistently. Please revise.

Corrected

5) Line 319. The term 'land surface' is repeated multiple times. Please review.

I replace one land surface by “which” to increase the readiness of the sentence.

Best regards,
Guillaume MARIE