**Comment 1:**

1. It is suggested to introduce the basic algorithm of EDFM in the text.

**Response 1:**

Thank you for the suggestion. We remark that the third paragraph of section 4 comments on the EDFM characterization workflow, and the ones that follow list the formulation.

**Comment 2:**

2. It is suggested to introduce the prominent advantages and disadvantages of various models in the

**Response 2:**

Thank you for the suggestion. Section 3 is dedicated to discussing the various models, but as the paper focuses on EDFM, the discussion of each method in detail would be overwhelming and defocus the reader. However, sections 5 and 6 deal with the different flavors of EDFM. We changed the text to emphasize the pros and cons, especially when dealing with low permeability fractures.

**Comment 3:**

3. It is suggested to add more explanations on the definition of fractures, such as geological, hydraulic fracturing mechanics.

**Response 3:**

Indeed, formal definitions of fractures and their classification are key to discussing DFM. We reserved section 2 for that. The first paragraph covers the best definition of fractures to our knowledge. The second paragraph describes the classification and the following present challenges and common issues during modeling.

**Comment 4:**

4. It is not recommended to provide multiple explanations for abbreviations. (as line 27 and 86, NFR is explained twice, as same as NF in line 38 and 105).

**Response 4:**

Thank you for your comment. The abbreviations were revised and only repeated in specific contexts, specifically when their definition is provided in detail.

**Comment 5:**

4. There are some citation errors in the figures and tables in the manuscript. Line 199、226、288、311、402、412 and 546.

**Response 5:**

Sorry for the mistake. It was fixed.