

Subject: Erratum on previous answer to comments

Dear Reviewer,

In this erratum, we would like to point out additional modifications we brought to the manuscript in relation to questions you posted in your review.

In answer to your comment about line 501 in the original manuscript: "Do you suggest any specific approach? how important is the role of these parameters?", we have added the following text in line 203 of the modified manuscript:

"The different  $\alpha$  terms are trade-off parameters that control the importance given to the different terms during the inversion. These terms therefore play an important role and need to be determined carefully (see Sect. 4.1 and 4.2 for more details)."

We have also added the following in Section 4.1, line 481 of the revised manuscript:

"We chose this approach for its simplicity and note that there exist other techniques that use an automated process, such as the generalized cross-validation technique (Craven and Wahba, 1978)."

In answer to your comment about line 713 in the original manuscript: "Do you mean this the expert input to speculate after having gained some experience?", we have added the following text in line 718 of the modified manuscript:

"We note that this ranking remains speculative as it might apply only to models sharing similarities with the case we investigated."

References:

Craven, P. and Wahba, G.: Smoothing noisy data with spline functions, *Numer. Math.*, 31, 377–403, doi:10.1007/BF01404567, 1978.