Dear Editor;

I have read the manuscript entitled " The weather today rocks or sucks for my tree: Exploring the understanding of climate impacts on forests at high school level through tweets" and have provided some general comments below.

The manuscript topic is interesting and has merit and will attract many readers. There are numerous studies investigating the physiological response of forests to meteorological variables and impact of climate change on forests. However, since the results of these studies are mostly interpreted by researchers who are experts on the subject, they do not show how the public interprets the relationship between meteorological parameters and climate change and forests. For these reasons, the fact that the study targets the young generation, which will be heavily affected by the negative effects of climate change in the future and will play an important role in the mitigation against climate change, increases the importance of the study.

At the same time, I believe the manuscript needs more elaborated description, especially for the methods. In particular, the details of the education that high school students received within the scope of the study in their geography lessons and whether they were educated to understand especially tree diameter changes and sap flow cannot be understood from the text. On the other hand, it was stated that the students tweeted a small number of times, but the information about their motivation for tweeting was not included in the text. Are students completely free to tweet? Or were students told that their tweets would be used for a scientific study and therefore they were expected to tweet frequently?

Another point that limits the success of the study is that the selected period included only one week. It appears that this week was chosen because it involved a sharp variation in meteorological parameters and therefore a difference in the response of the trees. However, here the question of whether the selected week was at the end of the semester comes to mind. An examination to be carried out over a longer period would perhaps reveal that as the education the students received increased, they improved in their verbal expression of meteorological parameters and the response of trees to changes in these parameters.

Apart from the mentioned points, it would be appropriate to correct some minor errors, such as in the caption of Figure 1 (metre-by-meter). I also suggest mentioning the brand and the type of the devices used for physiological measurements in the relevant section. The resolution of the graphics in the preprint version I downloaded was quite low. I think it would be useful for the readers to check the resolution of the figures used in the text and increase it if possible.