

Reply to Referee #2 report 19 Oct 2022

Dear Referee #2,

Thank you for your appreciation of our revised manuscript and data. Please find below our response to your two remaining comments.

RC2, Comment 1: “Fig 3.: Since the term „CML“ does not appear in the figure it is not 100% clear if one „CML“ is one „link“. If the term „CML“ is not added to the figure, it should be made clear in the figure caption which of the shown parts comprise one CML.”

Authors' response: We clarify this in the revised figure caption.

Authors' changes: Revised caption of Fig. 3.

RC2, Comment 2: “L18 and L19: My suggestion would be to use „k“ for specific attenuation (dB/km) as it is commonly done in radar meteorology. Since „A“ has also been used as symbol for specific attenuation in the CML literature before, this is just a minor suggestion.”

Authors' response: The literature is indeed not consistent in the use of terms, and sometimes uses the same term for different concepts. However, we have changed to k in Eq. 1 as you suggested and also changed the parameters to make them unique relative to the Z-R relationship (Eq. 4).

Authors' changes: Eq. 1 changed.

In addition, we also made some very minor changes to the text and figures to clarify or adapt to the fact that figures had to be submitted as single composites (e.g. Figure 2, Figure 4, section 2.1 and Table 4).