

I want to thank the authors for their patience in explaining to me the principal on which this method is based. I can see that the example I gave in my previous review (with two mirror-image transects) represents a rather unique case for which this method would not work, and that in theory it could work under more general conditions where the mean wind during the release was perpendicular to the transects. The changes made to the text and the additional SI figures have also helped to clarify this. I suggest that this revised manuscript should be published in AMT.

As future work, it could be interesting to use a CFD model to simulate some other possible releases, then test how many transects would be required for this Gaussian plume inversion method to accurately estimate the release rate and location. Anyway that's just an idea – it's clearly well beyond the scope of this study and would involve a lot of work!