

This manuscript compares zonal wind measurements from a Na lidar and at the multi-static meteor radar system configured with Mengcheng Meteor Radar and Changfeng remote Receiver near Hefei, China. The meteor radar data used for comparison include Mengcheng Meteor Radar (MCMR), Changfeng remote Receiver (CFR), and wind derived closer to the lidar beam using the Volume Velocity Processing (VVP) method. The results demonstrate that MCMR, CFR and VVP zonal winds show good consistency with lidar zonal winds. Meanwhile VVP zonal winds exhibit better agreement with the lidar above 90 km, both in zonal wind variance and radar-to-lidar zonal wind ratio, suggesting that the VVP method provides a reliable approach for retrieving meteor radar winds and can improve wind estimates in the 90–98 km region.

I see that the authors have followed the suggestions of the reviewers and supplemented the descriptions on coincident observations of three instruments, measurement uncertainties, and discussion of the high consistence of Na lidar and VVP method above 90 km. I have no more comments.