

The manuscript is much improved by the review process and I suggest it should be published after these minor revisions:

- The sensitivity to outliers should be mentioned in the abstract.
- When asking the author if codes with the method implemented were available the reply was: *“No codes or demonstration scripts have been included as part of this submission. Given that the method is relatively straightforward, involving only a handful of well- defined mathematical operations, it seems unnecessary to provide a template for applying the method.”* I would argue that since the method is straightforward, all the more reason to include a demonstration script. A simple script is easier for the readers to follow. I also suggest the author upload the synthetic data that is used in the sensitivity analysis. This also follows the guidelines and recommendations of the journal.

Finally, two points regarding references that I missed in the first review:

- There is a citation to a discussion paper. It is better to cite the final version as written below (and to include the accent over the authors first name ;-)
Hannesdóttir, Á. and Kelly, M.: Detection and characterization of extreme wind speed ramps, Wind Energ. Sci., 4, 385–396, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wes-4-385-2019>, 2019.
- The IEC 61400-1, p. 177, 2005 citation seems to be wrong (p.4 line 19). There is no mention of cup anemometers in this document and it is only 92 pages. Perhaps another IEC standard should be referenced here?