

Thanks again for the feedback! All minor comments have been addressed and all technical corrections have been amended. The title in Fig 8 (last but one point made by the referee) is correct, but there was a mistake in the figure caption (it is actually exp. 1a,b and 4a, b with experiments “b” being those with moisture correction switched off) which has been corrected.

**minor comments:**

- L695f: This sentence no longer applies for the re-plotted Fig. 5. The revised data suggest: “SH04 has a 0.2 m s<sup>-1</sup> lower threshold velocity than AG01 and MB95.”

- L754f: L05 (Fig. 6g) needs to be added to this sentence noting that it is discussed later in this section.

**technical corrections:**

- general: all units italic, e.g., “min” (L201), “cm” (L203)

- general: mainly American spelling but some inconsistencies, e.g., “colour” (Fig. 1 caption and elsewhere), “modelled” (L18 and elsewhere)

- page1: the e-mail address at the bottom overlaps with the text.

- L3: “emission schemes”

- L167: “of” -> “above” ?

- L520: “experiments”

- L239: “(Wang et al., 2009).” can be skipped here, at least the dot at the end.

- L368: “shift”

- L602f: “with a much smaller model ...”

- L700: “reveal”

- L703: “0.2 m s<sup>-1</sup>” !

- L750f: “coincident”

- L880: “events”

- L996: “seems”

- L1019ff: Wording is a bit confusing. Please reword this sentence “In an ideal ...”

- Fig. 1 caption: “Red: Well developed”

- Fig. 7: Not all arrows point to the correct lines: (a) the lower arrow must point from the red to the yellow line; (c) the uppermost arrow must point from the yellow to the gray line.

- Fig. 8: The title of panel (d) should read “(moist & drag corr OFF)”, right ?!

- Table 2 caption: “Individual model setups”