

Overall, the paper has improved a lot. The authors have done a good job addressing all the comments given by the reviewers. The conclusions are more moderate now and they provide the relevant information to judge the approach taken. I think there is one scientific discussion left concerning the paper that deals with the choice of model and the impact of it on the results. However, the authors acknowledge this now in the discussion so I think science should take it up and provide a further analysis by building on this study. Hence, I would suggest to accept the current version of the paper.