

Point on "2.2 subsidence" - could you please find a way to make sure the same confusion cannot occur to other readers, too?

We have added a clarification of the namelist variable used when the prescribed subsidence rate is discussed in the manuscript (page 10).

Point on "2.5 Turbulent..." - please consider the statement suggested by the reviewer that for the given cases, the resolution is not quite large-eddy-resolving.

We have added statement, as suggested by the reviewer, about the lack of LES regime near the end of the simulations to the discussion of the results (page 13).