

We appreciate the report regarding our revised version of the paper and are thankful for the technical corrections, which have been implemented immediately.

One point seems a little controversial:

*Referee comment:*

Page 14, Eq. 9: The authors may want to stick to the name of the variables previously introduced. There seems to be no particular reason to rename  $KGE'$  to  $E$  and  $KGE^-$  to  $E_r$ .

*Authors response:*

The [HESS Manuscript Preparation Guidelines for Authors](#), section "Textual and visual conventions", subsection "Symbols and equations" paragraph "b" states that: "Multi-letter variables should be avoided. Instead use single-letter variables with subscript[...]" . Consequently we decided to change Eq. 9 in the revised version of the paper. Apart from the adherence to the cited convention, we also think that the renaming of  $KGE'$  and  $KGE^-$  for the use within Eq. 9 makes little sense.

Within the resubmitted LaTeX source file (lines 388–408), we provide both variants (strictly single-lettered, renamed variant of Eq. 9 and the respective explanation as well as the original multi-lettered variant with the respective explanation). Currently the single-lettered variant is commented out and the multi lettered variant is active. In agreement with the referee, we would prefer the multi-lettered variant, but we cannot decide whether higher intelligibility (as provided by the multi-lettered variant without renaming of  $KGE'$  and  $KGE^-$  to  $E$  and  $E_r$ ) is enough to justify a disregard of HESS' conventions. We would like to leave this decision to the editor. In case the single-lettered variant is preferred, lines 392–396 of the LaTeX source file would have to be uncommented, while lines 401–406 would have to be commented out.