

Answer to Co-Editor Decision

We thank the co-editor for carefully reading our manuscript, for the constructive comments and for the decision to publish after some technical corrections. In the following we will respond to the minor comments and point out any changes we made. The line numbers and figure references in the reviewer's comments refer to the revised submission. The reviewer's comments are in black italic; our responses are in blue.

Comments to the Author

This all looks very good now, except for:

1) *Why do you use "offset" instead of "decay"? This does not make any sense to me. Offset means "Versatz" in German.*

We have no particularly strong interest in using "offset" instead of "decay". However, we decided for "offset" as we felt that this well represents the opposite process to "onset" while "decay" bears the connotation of a continuous process. As we cannot represent a continuous decay with the model, we decided to avoid this. Nevertheless, we see that the word "offset" brings also other connotations along, such as a spatial or temporal shift. We are open to change "offset" to "decay" as this will by no means change the message of the article.

2) *I don't like the balance between motivation and method on one side and results on the other side in your abstract. The latter only fills two sentences. Wouldn't it be good to make at least some short statements about the other seasons?*

You are right. We have added a few important results from the other months. Now the abstract should be more balanced.

3) *Table 1: Say why E05 is red in caption?!*

We have added the following sentence to the caption to explain why E05 is highlighted in red: "Most of the results presented in sections 4.2, 4.4, and 5 are based on the E05 set-up, hence the entry is highlighted in red. "

4) *Fig. 12: Please use a larger font without serifs for better readability.*

We have changed the font and size and inserted the new figure.

5) *L560: the authors' perception*

Thanks. We have corrected it.

6) *L685: remove "It turns out, that"*

We have removed it.