
Manuscript #POP28745B:

Editor's Comments:

Please upload the source file for the text for the final version of the paper.

Reviewer Comments:

The authors have provided satisfactory responses to all my concerns and I now recommend publication.

The authors requested my opinion about a couple of the figures. For Fig. 1 my preference is the alternate file on their web site. I think the ellipses in Fig. 1(b) will definitely help the reader visualize the geometry better, especially when the figure is reduced to final size. The problem

I don't totally agree, but I'm willing to do it. It's included in the new version of the manuscript.

that some of the beam paths lie above the ellipses is very minor and will not lead to confusion. For Fig. 17, I agree with the authors that their choice of version 3 is the best.

I found a few minor typos, etc.

1. p. 6. Last sentence of first full para should say "The time variations".

Done.

2. p. 7, near top, should say "error bars".

Done.

3. p. 18, line 5, there is a superfluous ")".

Done.

4. p. 18, end of first para, "we have discussed" should be omitted as superfluous.

Done.

5. p. 18, 9 lines from bottom. I suggest removing "It is easily seen from the color map in Fig. 17 that". Fig. 17 doesn't contain a color map, and we can't see the temperature in the entire halfraum in the figure.

There is color-coding in the rand-hand panel..but, OK. Done.

6. Ref. 12 should read "Meyer-ter-Vehn".

Yes...apparently it's a latex/bibtex problem, that I can't figure out how to solve. I'll point it out to the editorial office.

7. Fig. 8 caption. Delete "The trend of" as superfluous.

Done.

8. p. 26, the Fig 13 and 14 captions are mispositioned.

It's a latex bug; the editorial office is aware of it.

9. Fig. 2. Use "sample surface element" for consistency with the caption.

I changed the caption wording to agree with the figure notation (it's got simpler wording, anyway) and the original wording in the caption wasn't self-consistent anyway.

