

Response to Reviewers

We thank reviewer 1 for their additional comments, which we respond to individually below.

1. ***I suggest to add a comment on the minimum resolvable wavelength. Both reviewers asked to clarify this, and (although it is obvious) it is worthwhile confirming that the method can do nothing to overcome this limitation.***

The text “but with a lower limit (i.e. minimum resolvable wavelength) of twice the level spacing.[†]” has been added to the paragraph starting on line 225 of the revised version.

2. ***I suggest to re-add the paragraph on the computation of the vertical wavelength. The readers might figure it out themselves, but it was a helpful description nonetheless, and it is advertised in the figure caption. I don't know why it was removed.***

The removal of this paragraph was a typographical error by the lead author, which was not noticed until a few days after resubmission by which point the article would already have been sent out to reviewers. It has been restored in this draft to the original unchanged version.