

Response of the authors:

The authors would like to thank the editor for the time investigated to review this paper. We addressed the suggested points. In the current version of the file, only the changes according to editor reviews are highlighted, while the previous upload one contains all changes according to the reviewer suggestions.

Editor	Response of the authors
The introduction would greatly benefit from properly stating a science question or even better an hypothesis that is tested.	Thank you for the suggestion. Text is added to the introduction (see (1) in the pdf file).
I would avoid the term spatially highly variable in the context to interpolation methods. Any interpolation method is a weighted average and smoothes out variability (in contrary to simulation methods).	That's correct. We modified the text where it is necessary. The remote sensing-based water vapor data have a high spatial density.
Please be accurate: a la grange multiplier is not introduced to assure an unbiased constraint but to assure unbiased estimates...	Yes this is correct, and it is exactly what is written in (3)
There is a little too much self-citing with respect to the use of WRF and data assimilation, please give merits to the achievements of other groups.	New references are added.
I agree with reviewer II that the explanation of kriging is not very helpful as is stands. I teach geo-statistics and had problems in understanding what it is about (I usually start with Eq.7). What I miss in this context, is that the entire quality of any kriging method crucially depends the quality of the experimental variogram or co-variogram (this is where the information is) and density of the data points.	This section is rewritten (2).
Maybe I missed it, but I did not see an experimental variogram or co-variogram from the data sources you use and I didn't find any point on the theoretical variogram or co-variogram function you are using (neither on the points whether data have been de-trended before variogram estimation).	Yes, we discussed that in the text and the appendix shows the method to obtain the variogram. We added Fig. 9 (4). Fig. 14 also shows another example.
I also wonder why you did not cross validate your spatial estimates within a Jack Knifing, to test and compare the quality of the spatial models.	We appreciate this suggestion, which we will use in the future with a larger dataset. This is added in the paper outlook.