Reviewer Comments and Responses

First, I would like to thank the reviewers and editor for the comments and supportive critique throughout the submission. I have incorporated fixes to, I believe, satisfy their concerns.

The responses are organized per commenter and in blue, with concision in mind.

R1 (Report 2) Comments

There are a few minor issues, mainly clarifications:

1. I suggest clarifying the random character of g1 in eq. (1) (I mean, stating what is fixed and what is random). For example, a sentence of the type: 'The distribution of the set of values of g1 at different times, for fixed xi, can be characterized by EVT' could be inserted just after eq. (1).

I have expanded the description of g1 and z around Eq. 1 to make it much more clear (I believe). It should now be easy for the reader to understand the steps of the method, what g1 and z represent, how they are calculated, and how EVT applies.

2. When describing the flattening of x(t) (line 100) it would be good to state that the temporal dimension is not flattened: '... is calculated by flattening, at each time step, xi and x(t =/= t_i) into 1D vectors during the comparison. '

Yes, you're right. I have added that they are only flattened for the spatial dimensions and reinforced that the temporal dimension is not flattened, as it is per time step.

3. Also, some re-reading would be needed to eliminate a number of typos (e.g. 'describe' -> 'described' in line 161, 'this is appears' -> 'this appears' in line 165, 'random process like'-> 'random-process like' in caption of fig. 6, 'last for four assumptions' -> 'last four assumptions' in line 251, 'hypotheses' -> 'hypothesis' in line 252, "it's"->" its" in line 253, etc.)

Ah yes, they got through my revisions. I have reread my work and fixed errors where I could find them. Thank you!

R2 (Report 1) Comments

No changes were suggested by the second reviewer.