

The authors have done a good job on most of the revisions/responses and the additions are clear. Thank you for this work. However, I still have one major comment that should be addressed. I am recommending major revisions to address this comment.

I disagree about the choice of 1 km horizontal grid spacing used in the NOAA P3 retrievals. It doesn't make much sense to use grid spacing below the actual sampling of the radar because the energy will be significantly reduced here anyway. The authors can choose whatever grid spacing they want (even 50-meter spacing), but this doesn't mean anything because these scales are not sampled, and they will be severely damped in the retrievals. The best horizontal grid spacing one can get is limited by the beam sampling interval, which is ~ 1.4 km for the current data. NOAA HRD uses slightly larger grid spacing at 2 km because of this but could probably get away with ~ 1.4 km spacing. The Koch et al. paper is useful, but very old and it only addresses the influence of the weighting factor or influence radius in the data "resolution". New research has shown that the real "resolution" of wind retrieval methods is larger than that quoted by the authors ($4dx$) and has other contributions from the solution method (3DVAR), additional filtering sometimes used such as Laplacian filtering, post-processing and QC methods. In addition, the authors need to state in the paper the raw sampling of the P3 radials (~ 1.4 km) and the Gaussian filtering applied ($4dx$), which results in fully resolved fields at 5.6 km, which is really the best it can get. Currently, none of this is mentioned in the paper.