

Final response to Editor

Marco van Hulten et al.

8th February 2017

Dear editor,

Thank you for accepting the manuscript. We have made the necessary changes as proposed.

Please, correct the following: - Abstract, p.2 l.4: What is meant by “the complete model”?
Would not “the model” suffice here?

Indeed, this was sufficient. We have removed “complete” from both occurrences of this phrase in the manuscript.

- You use now “veracious/veracity” for “accurate/accuracy”. I think this makes things worse as “veracious/veracity” is not used in our field in this context. Please, choose another wording. I suggest to use “adequate”, “reasonably accurate”, “as close as possible to the observations”, “in a quantitatively appropriate way”, or something like this. Please, replace “veracious-(ly)/veracity” by something else wherever it occurs in the text.

We have followed this suggestion. It is also still clear to what type of “accuracy” we refer to.

- P.14 l.5: Replace “we will mainly use” by “we mainly use” (use correct tense as in rest of paragraph). - P.19 l.28: Perhaps replace “properties” by “features”?

We have applied those two minor improvements.

Thank you again.

On behalf of the authors, sincerely,

Marco van Hulten