

We as authors thank the reviewers and the editor for reading and assessing our manuscript. We would like to keep the overall structure as in the last version, however we needed to make some minor changes:

1) Due to carelessness, there was a rather large conversion error in the conversion of the mass flux from $\text{g/cm}^2/\text{min}$. to $\text{kg/m}^2/\text{h}$. Therefore, we had to convert the mass flow (see Text and Figures). However, this does not change anything of the conclusions, since for our comparisons in the very first place is the relative mass flux at different time and we do not aim here to evaluate the total mass flux. Nevertheless, it was important to correct this - we apologize for this and hope that this is not too big a problem.

2) We had to add a limit to the significance of the upper SPC data because it shows unnatural spikes in some places (Section 2.6). However, we decided to use the data set as a comparison, since it shows well the magnitude of the mass flux that can be expected at that altitude, compared to the lower SPC.

3) The lower SPC was actually installed at about 0.1 m above the surface, not 0.5 m. We corrected this.

4) Corrections of minor spelling errors.

Kind regards,
On behalf of the authors,

David Wagner