

The authors have worked hard to address my original comments. The paper is much improved as:

- The method is expanded and better structured
- The authors no longer oversell the evaluation results from comparing different lead classification methods with MODIS imagery. For example, I now agree with the abstract statement that waveform mixture analysis shows “comparable and promising performance” compared with other lead detection methods, rather than the “better performance” stated before.
- Display items are clear

However, I have a few remaining comments that should be addressed. Please see below.

P6 L12-14: The highlighted addition still doesn't explain which particular orbit files are selected. First of the month? A consistent date each time?

P7 L6: “...months and years should be compared **\*\*using visual analysis\*\*** with the waveforms... i.e. introduce the method of comparison here rather than L9.

P7 L9: The authors should comment on the limitations of such a visual analysis, rather than a statistical one, to compare waveforms.

P10 L10-13: Please explain in the manuscript that as the percentage of permuted observations increases, the grid sensitivity also increases but the difference is not significant, hence 30% was chosen.