Reply to Reviewer:

The authors thank the reviewer for helping to improve the submitted manuscript and finding all the typos.

Comment 1:

The defining of the different algorithms ('naming') presented in the manuscript is now much clearer. For even better clarity I strongly suggest the authors continue this in Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7. For example (version 3, not the difference version):

Comment:

P.12, l.12: 'A crucial part of the wind field analysis...', name of which one presented?

P.13, l.9: 'The introduced wind retrieval algorithm for...', which one?

....

and elsewhere in Sections 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Reply:

We updated the sections using the introduced namings. When no specific name is mentioned, the statement or sentence is valid for all the different retrieval versions.

Comment 2:

Equ. 7 (Equ. 2 in ver2) on P.6, l.21 (ver3): I believe you missed this in your revision.

The equation should be (see 2nd term in product of 2nd term of sum on RHS):

$v_{r,i} = u_j \cos(\phi_i) \sin(\theta_i) + v_j \sin(\phi_i) \sin(\theta_i) + ...$

^^^

NOT

$v_{r,i} = u_j \cos(\phi_i) \sin(\theta_i) + v_j \cos(\phi_i) \sin(\theta_i) + ...$

^^^

Relpy:

Done.