

Dear Pedro, thank you very much for providing the first and second review. It helped very much to improve the manuscript.

The authors replied to all comments from the other referee and me. The changes in the manuscript have made it more precise and easier to digest.

Some of the figures could still use some attention. In Figure 9, I see the colours in the dotted plots but do not know what they mean. At the very least, this must be stated in the figure caption.

Thank you for the comment. We added some explanation to the caption.

Figure 9 and many others are pixelated, so I cannot read the axis labels and legends.

The figures are pixelated because they are only provided in the pdf directly (converted from Word). I replaced them with high resolution images, but during the pdf conversion the quality is reduced again. However, for the final version the original figures should be used.

@Editor: Can you please verify if the original image files are requested for the typesetting?

Moreover, Figures 10 and 15 from the previous version are still in the manuscript and the ATC files, although I suppose the authors wanted to remove these figures.

Thank you for noticing the important error on page 20 and 24. Indeed, these figures should not have been there. A struggle with Word...

In Figure 11, the abbreviations/labels on each panel are confusing. Why not use a letter to identify each panel and then give the details in the figure caption?

Thank you for the suggestion. However, we prefer it this way to keep the figure caption short and we refer to table 2 where all abbreviations are explained.

This is such a nice manuscript, and I would like to see it presented better.

Best wishes,

Pedro