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We greatly appreciate the detailed and constructive suggestion of the second reviewer. The manuscript has been modified according to his remarks. The specific comments have been commented one by one in the following, while the technical correction have all been included in the revised version of the paper and will not be commented.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS

RC: Abstract, line 8-11: the year of the campaign should be reported somewhere around here.

AC: The dates of the field campaign have been included in the abstract.

RC: Section 4, page 5330, lines 22-24: you use the term SMVmod for an index derived analogously to SWVI. Why not name it SWVImod then?

AC: We understand the point of the reviewer, but we believe that the actual notation is more appropriate. Nevertheless, we have changed the notation on the graphs including the term $SMV_{mod}$ in order to avoid confusion.

RC: Tables 1 and 2: you present the “Spatial mean” in the tables. Is this the same variable as described in section 3.1, lines 19-20 (“mean SM”)? If so, I would name it the same way in the text and in the table.

AC: The mean SM refers to the mean value of SM in each site, while the spatial mean represents the mean obtained using all SM values estimated in each site. This concept has been clarified in the text of the revised paper.

RC: Table 4: why is the variable “p” given in brackets?

AC: The table has been modified removing the brackets.

RC: Figure 7: you could advance the plot by providing dates instead of days of year or add precipitation to the plot. This would help interpreting effects of winter/summer seasons or the influence of vegetation.

AC: We agree with the reviewer. This figure has been modified according to his suggestions.