We would like to thank the reviewer for his or her time and are happy to see that they believe that our manuscript meets the expectations for acceptance into GMD. The reviewer appears to have one comment that needs to be addressed:

“More detail explanation [of MMS] would be good for the readers.”

While we would like to address this point, we are unsure how to proceed without knowing what areas need specific attention. We have dedicated a large portion of this paper to illustrate the use of MMS and the interpretation of the MMS results; it is hard for us to elaborate without outsider guidance. The other reviewers have listed specific points that we have addressed; we hope that these overlap with this reviewer’s concerns and
that the latest manuscript more clearly describes MMS. If the reviewer provides more
details as to which areas should be revised or expanded, we will be happy to change
the manuscript to meet his or her concerns.
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