

Response to Editor's comments

EDITOR's comment – minor revision

Public justification (visible to the public if the article is accepted and published):

I'm happy to accept this manuscript for publication subject to a few minor corrections.

Both reviewers 1 and 2 have already accepted this manuscript. However, reviewer 3 felt that the changes made after the first review made the manuscript less clear than it was originally. It introduced a number of sections that did not add to the paper's main point and did not clarify areas that required clarification.

This revised manuscript removes the added sections and clarifies the points that were not clear in either the original or first revised manuscript, in line with the comments of reviewer 3.

We thank the editor for careful consideration of our manuscript and for constructive comments throughout.

The points that still require attention are:

Please clarify the section on the red noise test. In particular the paragraph beginning line 206 contains 3 possible ways of testing for significance. Please explain the situations in which each of the methods is the best choice.

We have added some examples, though it is not limited to those. See l. 206-213. The choice is ultimately up to the scientist as they know what they are interested in. For the sake of robustness, it may be better to test different methods on the same data nonetheless.

The sentence beginning line 208, "Thus significance of modes..." is not clear.

This sentence has now been removed as it is unnecessary.

Please check that all of the colourbars in figures have units, e.g, 4/5. If standardised state this on the colourbar.

We have now stated units or mentioned that values are standardised next to the colourbar (figs. 4, 5, S3).