

Reviewer 2

The authors have put many efforts to improve the quality and the clarity of the paper. For example, authors expanded the Introduction and included additional discussion on their methodologies, such as choice of the wavenumber threshold, as an appendix. In addition, I found that more detailed scientific and meteorological interpretations have been added to the text, which definitely helps reader to understand the result in depth. For future review process, though, it will be helpful if authors can provide additional notes on the line numbers where changes have been made. It was somewhat difficult to follow which portion of the main text was updated. I recommend this paper to be accepted, but please correct the typo (see below).

Reply: we thank the reviewer for appreciating our effort to improve and clarifying the manuscript. We apologise for not having sufficiently pointed towards the lines in the new version of the manuscript where changes have been performed. These were mentioned in the section “Changes” of the reply to reviewer document, but we could have missed referring to them in some of the comments.

Minor comment

1. Typo: I think the figure caption of Figure 4 should be “same as in Figure 3...”.

Reply: thanks for pointing this out. The caption has been corrected accordingly.