Anonymous referee #3 correctly calls to my attention two more publications that should be referenced in this manuscript. The first of these was an oversight on my part, for which I apologize. The comment about using old data convinces me that I should give an explanation of the history of this manuscript.

When I retired in 1998 the mesoscale fluctuation analysis was essentially complete. Since I have an aversion to publishing I got away with avoiding the task for several years. It gradually became clear to me that my data was unique, and it could be decades before anyone else produced comparable data with an isentrope analysis. Guilt reached a threshold in 2003, when I decided to try to publish. Two other journals rejected the MS, based on mixed reviews - one of which also complained about the data being old. It would have been easy to let things drop, but I decided to give it one more try using a publishing format that draws commentary from “interested” reviewers. I am gratified by the quality of response by ACPD anonymous reviewers and so far I
have included all constructive comments in my planned final version.

Concerning the matter of decade old data, I fail to see the problem. Presumably the generation of waves near the surface, and their growth with altitude, are governed by an atmospheric physics that can be counted upon to remain unchanged for at least a decade. If the data were a century old, and if no one else had such data, it would still merit publication.

Concerning uncited publications from the last 8 years, I continue to rely upon the help of those who have been reading the journals during that time. I fear that the final version will still be missing relevant citations.

Thanks to all reviewers, so far, for constructive commentaries and reference oversights.
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