

Response to the Comments

Color code:

comments of the reviewer

response by the authors

proposed changes in the manuscript

General comment:

The paper has an impressive author list and I am sure that the results are worthwhile to publish. But in my mind the pdf-format is not a best way to publish figures including an impenetrable jungle of line plots. You would need a shorter summary in pdf and then an interactive web-page where you could extract detailed results.

General response:

Certainly interactive figures would be a better way to present the data. There are even technologies to include interactive features in PDF files, e.g. U3D (see https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Universal_3D). However, since Copernicus does not support such interactive PDF files this is no solution. To set up a website with interactive figures can be achieved with reasonable effort. But, also such a website cannot act as an official part of a Copernicus publication. It can only be a supplement, not a replacement.

A shorter summary is very difficult to achieve. We attempt to do justice to 33 data sets, resulting not only literally in a million figures. How to condense all this information into a sustainable amount has been part of many and quite sustained discussions within the WAVAS-II core team. We are always open to new ideas. Since the critique here is rather vague we opt to work with the comments that the other reviewer provided on this topic.

Shortening of Sect. 5.4.