Dear Editor,

First of all, let us say that we are grateful for your expert help. Our answers to your last comments are below.

In addition to the revised version of the manuscript, we are submitting as a supplement a version of the manuscript with all changes relative to the last version highlighted.

> Dear Authors,
> Thank you very much for your updated review. I think we are very close to acceptance. I can see two last items I would like to see fulfilled:
> **a)**
> Sorry, but I still think it is still not clear what is the original input of this paper modelwise in this chapter 2…it remains "diluted" in the several pages descriptions of the model. **PLEASE**, at least clearly state the originality in a few sentences either before section 2.1 or as a conclusive paragraph at the end of section 2.

We put additional explanations in p. 4, l. 9-13 and p. 5, l. 6-12. Also the originality was stated in the introduction (p. 2, l. 19-28).

> **b)**
> I have made a few "formal" suggestions for changes in the phrasing of the newly added sections, as follows:
>
> Page 15:

Corrected.

> Page 16:
> What about the other potential parameters explaining discrepancy?...under pond ic not flat, presence of impurities, finite pond size,snow in receiver FOV, clouds..?..Why only selecting sediments?

You are right; there can be external factors that affect the spectrum. We deleted these two last sentences to avoid the excessive discussions.

> Page 17: -10

Corrected.

Thank you for suggestions for changes in the phrasing of the newly added sections.