

Comments on the manuscript 'Extraction of spatially confined small-scale waves from high resolution all-sky airglow images based on machine learning' by Sabine Wüst et al.

The authors replied to my comments well, and I think the manuscript is now acceptable. However, I would like to ask the authors to consider some technical edits in the followings. Thank you for reviewing the manuscript once again and for the final comments. I changed the manuscript accordingly.

L 94-100 (former line), L 100 (in revised version)

(My previous comment)

The description of the FAIM4.

It would be useful if the authors can also provide chip (or pixel) size of the InGaAs camera, and F number of the lens (or the effective aperture of the lens) for the reader to understand the sensitivity of the optics. (e.g. for knowing 'A x omega' value (throughput) of the camera.

(authors' response)

The pixel size was already given in the former line 95 (320x256pixel), we added the F-number.

(My new comment)

Thank you very much for adding the F number. Besides the pixel numbers (320 x 256 pixels), please provide the physical size of each pixel (for example, 20 um x 20 um, 40 um x 40 um etc. Or, the chip size, e.g., 9 mm x 12 mm etc.) that will help understand the sensitivity.

I am sorry for the misunderstanding. I included the info and adjusted the following sentence slightly to make the transition smoother.

Other minute points:

L 440

In autumn and winter a clear easterly component can be observed.

I believe 'easterly' means 'from east'. I propose to replace it by 'eastward'.

I changed it to "east" so it reads now "east component". This is consistent with the beginning of the sentence (west-southwest component) and we avoid possible confusion with easterly / eastward / ...