Comment on amt-2022-164
Christoph Thomas (Referee)

I now read both the responses to two reviews reports and the new split manuscripts. I thank the authors for taking the comments seriously and administering substantial changes as a result. I believe that the new presentation format as two separate, but related manuscripts serves the acceptance of the innovative TEA much better. I only have minor editorial comments, which would be nice to address, but is not a requirements:

1) The abstract and introductory sections of part 2 do not reference the companion paper Part 2. I think adding a simple sentence could guide the reader as to where to find what. (the first reference is found at the beginning of section 2).

2) In the new conclusions section, please add the 'alternative to the EC method'. Otherwise it is not clear what is meant here.