

The Authors want to thank the Reviewer for the constructive and detailed comments and want to express their sincere appreciation for the time into this review. The manuscript has been improved especially in parts where some paragraphs were not clear. The detailed answers to the reviewers' questions and/or remarks are given below.

Reviewer 2

Reviewer comment	Author response
The article is very well written and expresses the contents very clearly. However, the authors are encouraged to consider the following suggestions:	The Authors would like to thank the Reviewer for his/her appreciation. The manuscript has been improved according to your comments and suggestions.
Line 85: specify the initials EPFL: Ecole polytechnique fédérale de Lausanne	Thank you for your comment. The acronym was specified: EPFL (Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne).
Line 102: 2... put the paragraph title	The position of section 2 was wrong, this number was removed.
Lines 128-132 can be anticipated and placed at the end of the introduction	Since the position of section 2 was wrong, the paragraph in lines 128-132 is at the end of the introduction (section 1).
Line 165 why was zone 3 excluded from the simulations?	Thank you for pointing this out. The following sentence was added in lines 178-179 to clarify it. <i>"The monitoring data was available for every zone except zone 3, which was therefore excluded from the simulations (<u>not having the measured data it would not have been possible to evaluate the precision of the tested models</u>)."</i>
Figures 3 a and b improve the definition	The definition of Figures 3a and 3b was improved.
Figure 5a improve the quality	The quality of Figures 5a was improved.
Figure 5b put the color legend	The legend in Figures 5b was added.
Improve the quality of figures 9 (a, b, c, d) and figures 10 (a, b, c, d)	The quality of Figures 9 (a, b, c, d) and Figures 10 (a, b, c, d) was improved.