

I am convinced by the answers given by the authors except for one (see specific comment herebelow). However it is not a problem and I believe that the revised version of the manuscript can be published in ACP. I would like to compliment the authors for their very nice instrument and results.

Specific comment:

I am not convinced by the following explanation:

“We also applied the rectangular window method to the data set of wind observations. However, this did not lead to a separation of oscillation peaks at 30 and 50 days or other peaks. We therefore conclude that the extra-long period oscillation is not generally originating from two different oscillation peaks with periods differing by more than 20 days.”

If I understood correctly, Figures 2 and 3 show simulations from synthetic monochromatic signals that last about 300 days while the real signals last no longer than 80 days.

Hence, because of its shorter lifetime, the real signals should give a broader spectrum than the simulated ones. The authors may underestimate the spectral broadening and two peaks separated by 20 days may overlap.

However I am ok with the way it is written in the revised manuscript since the authors warns the reader of the lack of spectral resolution (“A 10 days period change is at the limit ...” p35047, L11)

Please note the typo P35044, line 27: “measruements”