

Dear Erwin Dreyer,

Thanks you for having conducted the review of our manuscript. I also thanks the reviewer for their constructive and thorough comments on our work. I am glad that you and the reviewers are satisfied with the revisions we've made and that our article can now be recommended in Peer Community In Forest & Wood Sciences.

I updated the manuscript to take into account your last suggestions. You will find below a comment for each suggestion.

Sincerely,

Camille Rouet

Valence, August 28, 2024.

- - - -

*Dear Camille Rouet*

*The revised version of the preprint " PDG-Arena: An ecophysiological model for characterizing tree-tree interactions in heterogeneous and mixed stands" has been examined again by the two reviewers who did the first round of reviews. Their comments were very positive, and as can be seen in their brief assessments, they believe the preprint can now be recommended. I completely agree with their assessment, and am ready to recommend the preprint after a small number of rather technical changes in the presentation of the text and of the data set associated with the preprint.*

*Detailed suggestions:*

*Preprint text:*

*1. Please provide a revised version without correction marks for the final recommendation and link. The correction marks were indeed very useful for assessing the changes made during the revision, but are no longer useful (the current version 2 on BioRxiv is fine).*

Ok. For information, the new version of the manuscript (V3 on bioRxiv) has a two-column layout and no numbering.

*2. A last proof reading of the V2 on BioRxiv would be useful to correct very minor typos along the text and produce the final, recommended version..*

It was done and some minor corrections were made.

*3. Please add to the preprint the reference to the data set under the classical format of a reference citation. The data set is a production per se, and needs to be clearly identified and referenced like other productions.*

The data set is cited in the main text using a classical format (Rouet, C., Morin, X., Druel, A., 2024. Inputs, results data and analysis script for the evaluation of the PDG-Arena forest growth model on beech-fir stands. doi:10.5281/zenodo.12191049.)

*4. In the list of data files, there is an incomplete reference to a code page (which is probably obsolete and of no use. Please remove it (or we can do it for you).*

I'm not sure to which list of data files and code page you're referring to. The only supplementary materials related to this paper are :

1) the PDG-Arena code that is accessible on the Capsis platform, only to members of the Capsis community. The code is not fully open yet because it is part of a previously existing model. If desired, a

discussion could be started with authors of CASTANEA and PDG to make it open. (In addition, a description of PDG-Arena will soon be added on the Capsis website.)

2) the Zenodo repository, which includes input data, the results data set and analysis script (<https://zenodo.org/records/12191049>).

If the URL you mentioned is on the PCI submission form and is not related to the Zenodo repository 12191049, then you can remove it.

*5. Please provide in the preprint an account for the different contributions of the co-authors (using the CreDIt taxonomy) and*

Contributions are given in the section “6.1. Author contributions”, using this taxonomy (which I think is CRediT): <https://www.elsevier.com/authors/policies-and-guidelines/credit-author-statement>

*Data and code sets:*

*Thank you for completing the data set and clarifying its presentation. I would nevertheless recommend a few additional changes:*

*1. Please provide a full title to the data set, and author names (i.e., all contributors to the data set). Title and author list may differ from those of the preprint. This, together with the DOI of the data set, will make it fully citable and easily findable.*

A proper title has been given to the data set and the appropriate co-authors has been added (see the above citation).

*2. The presentation text detailing the presented data and codes could be slightly extended and completed to better introduce the different formats and files (there are many...). This might help potential reusers of the data set and the codes.*

A new section “2.5 Access to model and data” was added in the main text (at the end of “2. Materials & Methods” section). It replaces the previous “Repository” subsection which was in the “6. Declarations” section. Section 2.5 firstly describes how the model is accessible, its integration into Capsis and how it can be run. Secondly, the section describes in more detail the files of the data set repository (which includes input data set, results data set and scripts).

*The model code is also presented on a different page with a different DOI: please provide also a title and the list of the authors and cite it in the reference list of the preprint.*

I don't understand to which DOI you're referring to. The model code is only on the Capsis platform and does not have any DOI.

*3. Please clarify the relationship to the Capsis platform: are there informations available on this platform that are of importance for running the model? Please clarify this relationship.*

Please see above.

*4. It will always be possible to complete the data sets with additional data in the future (crown section data for instance).*

Ok.

*We thank you very much for processing with these last steps, and are ready to prepare the final recommendation immediately after these last changes have been made.*

*With best regards and looking forward to the very final version of the preprint and the associated data.*

*Erwin Dreyer, recommender of this preprint in Peer Community of Forest and Wood Sciences.*

*Nancy, August 23, 2024.*