

Response to Associate editor comments on AMT 2018-75 “Evaluating two methods of estimating error variances using simulated data sets with known errors”

Associate Editor comments in italics are given below, followed by our responses:

Comments to the Author:

The authors well considered the reviewer and editor suggestions.

A last minor comment is that Stoffelen (1998) elaborated on the necessity of error modeling before calibration and validation of geophysical data in his Appendix A and in section A2 particularly elaborates on the fundamental weakness of 2-way comparisons. This is closely related to your new section 4.3 and you may want to refer to it.

Section 4.3 deals with the effect of error correlations, not biases nor calibration. Perhaps the editor means Section 4.4.3, which is a short section on the general effect of error biases. We do not feel that it is appropriate to include specific methods of dealing with biases in this section. In addition, we have already referred to Stoffelen’s error modeling and calibration in Section 5 of this paper, and in more detail in Appendix A3 of Anthes and Rieckh (2017) (AMT-2017-487).