

Responses to Editor's Comments

Dear Jenny:

Thank you for your comments and suggestions.

Please find below responses to your corrections and suggestions, in red text:

Both reviewers were very happy with your improvements to the paper and recommend publishing. I am in agreement.

The authors would like to thank you and both reviewers for your comments and suggestions, which have helped to focus and improve the manuscript.

Page 3, Line 22: Consider not starting the sentence with 'And so', perhaps just drop this. Not proper English grammar.

Thank you for this suggestion. The authors agree and the phrase "And so" has been removed.

Page 3, Line 32: Do you mean "Two-particle dispersion also explains". Is it more appropriate to say "describes"

It is more appropriate to say "describes" and the text has been changed accordingly.

Page 4, line 2: Ditto for "multi-particle analysis explains".

This too is changed in the revised manuscript.

Page 8, do you mean to have a prime on y in the equation? Number equations.

This was intended to be a comma rather than a prime on y in the equation. In addition, in consideration of your comments, equations are numbered in the revised manuscript.

Page 19, line 20: "shear-to-divergence"

This has been changed. Thank you.

Take this opportunity to make sure your main findings are clearly described in the conclusions.

Thank you, it has been a pleasure working with you.

It has been a pleasure working with you as well. The authors would like to thank you for your insight, contributions, and suggestions, which helped to clarify and focus the manuscript, and contributed to its improvement.

Regards,

Jennifer

Non-public comments to the Author and Editor:

Would you consider thanking the reviewers in your acknowledgments?

The authors thank and acknowledge your contributions and those of the reviewers in the revised version of the manuscript; your insight, patience, and suggestions are appreciated. However, am not sure if it is appropriate to include the names of the reviewers, since the second reviewer indicated a preference for anonymity in the acknowledgements, while the first reviewer indicated that anonymity is not a requirement. Please let me know what you think would be most appropriate.

Thanks once again for your help and suggestions.

Regards,

Jennifer