We are very happy with the comments received and have adapted the manuscript accordingly. A detailed response to the comments can be found in the attached word document. We hope that we have, in this new version, made it more clear that we do strongly encourage others to work with our data. And on the interpretation: we do realise we go quite far in interpreting our data, but that was intended to make explicit what interesting topics can be explored using the data (so actually in order to make the data interesting for others, as in point 1). We have also included a section called 'data collection' providing an overall description of the data quality and instrumentational failures. We do not provide the complete high-frequency data in order to keep the dataset standardised (we agreed upfront on standards for the processed data, but all high frequency data varies among the different partners involved and is very bulky and therefore more difficult to put on a data sharing platform. We recommend approaching the original surveyors.

Please also note the supplement to this comment: