Responses to Reviewer #2

- The authors have satisfactorily addressed all my comments.

**RESPONSE 2.1:**
Many thanks for this positive comment.

- I only have one minor comment: I’d suggest to incorporate Section 4.5 (Are satellite-derived LAI values reliable?) into Section 2.4 (LAI observations).

**RESPONSE 2.2:**
We agree with Reviewer 2 that Section 4.5 has to be linked to Section 2.4. We think that Section 4.5 as such is needed in the discussion section 4 because it results from discussions with reviewers. We added the following sentence at the end of Section 2.4:
“A discussion on the added value of this product can be found in Section 4.5”

- In addition, note that collection 6 MODIS LAI product has improved over collection 5 https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/8/6/460.

**RESPONSE 2.3:**
We rephrased the first part of Section 4.5 as:
“Our results show that the CGLS satellite-derived LAI product can be used to calibrate and operate the WCM. This LAI product has many advantages. It does not present the unrealistic large variations observed in products such as MODIS Collection 4 (e.g. [11]) and Collection 5 (e.g. [52], [53]). Also, the CGLS product is less prone to saturation effects than MODIS and compares much better to reference LAI maps containing ground observations [53]. Yan et al. [54] showed that the quality of the MODIS Collection 6 product is better than for Collection 5 and that the direct validation scores with respect to in situ LAI observations get closer to those given by [19] for the CGLS product.”

The following reference suggested by Reviewer 2 was added: