First of all we would like to thank the reviewer for the detailed and helpful review to further improve the quality of our paper. Below you can find the answers to the reviewing comments.

Change to data analysis:

We have contacted Prof. Caylor on January, 31st, 2014 via e-mail, but got no answer so far unfortunately. Thus we see no possibility to add the suggested correction which would for sure improve the validity of the paper.

Acronyms:

There are indeed many acronyms, especially in the results section which is mainly caused by the large number of experiments which are compared there. We will try to reduce the amount of acronyms wherever possible.

Minor corrections:

They will be all considered in the reviewed version of the paper.

Fig. 1:

We would like to keep Fig. 1 mainly for two reasons: First to show the reader the region of interest for our investigations and second to demonstrate and point out the low station density for verification, which was remarked as a major drawback of this study by another reviewer.