

Responses to the Reviewers' Comments

I appreciate the authors' efforts in addressing my concerns. I would like to recommend the acceptance of this manuscript for publication after addressing the minor comments below.

Response:

Thank you for your thoughtful review and for recognizing our efforts in addressing your previous concerns. We have carefully considered each of your comments and have made the necessary revisions to enhance the clarity and quality of our manuscript. Below, we outline our responses to your comments.

1. L140-141: Any supported references? Otherwise, the statement is opinionated.

Response:

Thank you for your feedback. In response to your question regarding supported references for the wind speed threshold of 6 m/s, we would like to clarify that there are indeed references available that outline maximum allowable wind speeds for takeoff and landing in the aircraft operating manuals provided by manufacturers. However, these wind speed limits can vary depending on the specific aircraft type.

In the context of this study, the 6 m/s threshold is specifically set for Guanghan Airport, a general aviation airport where flight training activities with small and medium-sized aircraft are the primary operations. This threshold indicates the wind speed at which adverse effects on flight activities may begin to occur. It is important to note that this figure is not a technical limit but rather a practical operational guideline designed to enhance safety during training flights. Exceeding this wind speed can impact aircraft handling and safety, particularly in a training environment where stability is crucial.

We acknowledge that our original statement lacked precision, and we have made appropriate revisions to enhance clarity. Thank you once again.

2. Table 1: "Micro-physical scheme" within the table was not changed.

Response:

Thank you for your comment regarding Table 1. We apologize for the oversight in my previous revision, where we mistakenly changed the incorrect location in the table.

In response to your comment, we have now corrected in Table 1.