

Dear Dr. Kanji,

We appreciate your efforts to expedite processing of the paper. We have addressed all of the points in your previous communication. See below for specific replies.

On behalf of the co-authors,

Will

In this document, the reviewer's comments are in black. Our responses to those comments are in red.

1) Regarding the uncertainty in the RTD of ± 0.001 K. Is this a manufacturer's uncertainty, or is it deduced from the calibration of the RTD against each other. If the latter, then how this uncertainty was reached should be described in section 2.2.

- The uncertainty of ± 0.001 K was determined during the calibration of the RTDs against each other. We have described the process for determining the uncertainty in Section 2.2.

2) Indeed, if it was the latter, then in line 115-116 of the track changes manuscript, this should report the manufacturer's uncertainty. And how 0.001 K was reached described in a separate sentence.

- We have reported the manufacturer's uncertainty and have described how we reached the uncertainty of ± 0.001 K in Section 2.2.

3) I would suggest adding to the caption of Fig.6 that the uncertainty is too small to plot on the graph.

- We have added "The uncertainty in the temperature is too small to be seen on the graph." to the caption of Fig.6.

4) Since time is an important component of this study, it would help to clarify that the quality of the fit in Fig. 6 does not change with time. Can that be clarified in the manuscript.

- We have added "The goodness of the fit does not change over time." to the caption of Fig.6.

5) Can the description of the calibration of the sonic temperature sensor be added to section 2.2, or alternatively a reference, if this has been done before in a previous study for the Pi Chamber.

- We have included a description of the calibration procedure to Section 2.2 of the manuscript.