

Thank you for revising the manuscript again. This is a much improved version. However, there are still certain things to be clarified for making a publication on ACP. Please consider the referee comments and the following to revise your manuscript, and submit it.

## **Page 1**

Line 06: We have analyzed wind velocities measured ...

Lin 06: GPS acronym should be expanded.

Line 07: GPS radiosonde, which is continuously flown for 120 h with an interval of 6 h

Line 09: to get the fluctuations from measurements? What are these fluctuations?

Line 13: acceptable results? How do we know that these are acceptable or not?

Line 13: The FIR1 filter also...

Line 17: delete large

Line 26: "are present", where?

Line 30: uncertainties in their calculations or estimates

Line 30: for errors or error sources

## **Page 2**

Line 01: This limits (not defeats)

Line 02: of hodograph

Line 02: in fact "the method can be used", not capable of doing it

Line 04: In this study, we attempt to reduce the uncertainties associated with...., write something like this.

Line 04: you cannot overcome, but minimize

Line 05: The instrument measures wind velocity. You compute the perturbations or fluctuations afterwards

Line 10—11: remove "provided by the manufacture" and then give a reference.

Line 15: interpolation / smoothing will not give you high resolution. You are just interpolating the values in between and that's all.

Line 21: in low latitudes

Line 23: continuous data with appropriate data gaps? Why?

Line 26: contain

Line 27: data are

Line 29: delete “in the present work”

Line 34: Further details of these filters

Line 37—38: “A Butterworth.....” for this particular study, not in general.

### **Page 3**

Line 04: “the wide band of”

Line 05: recommended the application of

Line 06: temperature measured by

Line 09: Perhaps, satisfies the criteria for applying the hodograph method

Line 10: “are quite noisy”

Line 24: space after the bracket

Line 27: between 20 and 28 h

Line 28: for Hyderabad and belong to

Line 29: ,respectively

Line 31: delete “Next”

Line 33: delete “but by using...filter”

Line 37: “producing good result”? How do we know that these results are good? Please justify with a relevant sentence/statement.

### **Page4:**

Line 02: are broader

Line 06: depicts different fits

Line 07—08: show good agreement

Line 08: what are appreciable differences?

Line 09: "and hodographs are made."

Line 09: subsequently not consequently

Line 14: very, not extremely

Line 16: delete: "instead of ...filter."

Line 19: for both wind components. If you use "respectively", then you need to write the "respective" components too.

Line 19: "It is shown that", remove clear. Let the readers decide whether this is clear to them or not.

Line 25: you can only reduce or minimize the uncertainty not remove it completely.

## **Page 5**

Line 01: five-day balloon measurements are OK for characterizing IGWs?

Please make a general statement on the measurements here. Characterization comes afterwards. People could also use the data for other purposes (not only for identifying IGWs studies).

Line 31: comma after Australia

Line 37: space before source

## **Page 6**

Line 03, 05, 07, etc..hyphen not minus sign

Line 29: comma after systems

Line 36: comma before but

These are some examples for language /syntax corrections. Please read and do other corrections. Thank you.