

Reply to the Reviewers comments

First, I'd like to thank the Reviewers for their second-look reviews and comments, which helped improve this article. Reply to the final comments and my explanations are listed below.

Reviewer #2

Reply to COMMENTS

I thank the authors for well addressing the points raised in my previous review. In my opinion the paper is essentially acceptable in its present form. There are two aspects that perhaps should be addressed:

1. You now explain the Paris inch & line (thanks), but I suggest doing this when they are first mentioned in the main text.

Response:

Following the reviewer's suggestion, the description regarding the Paris inches & lines "One Paris inch is 27.07 mm long and corresponds to 12 Paris lines of 2.256 mm (Lamb, 1986)." has been moved earlier in the text, from lines 134-135 to line 109.

2. In the conclusions you write in line 545: "However, this may be the result of the device's incorrect calibrations." I'm a bit surprised this appears in the conclusions without being mentioned in the results of the discussion section. Do you have any reason to believe that the calibration was wrong? The pressure measurement at this time was essentially a length measurement and this should be possible with very high accuracy?

Response:

As the reviewer noted, we have no reason to believe the calibration was wrong. The sentence "However, this may be the result of the device's incorrect calibrations." on line 545 has been removed from the text.

Thank you once again for all the remarks and comments

On behalf of the authors,

Konrad Chmist