

Dear editor,

We are, of course, very pleased by your decision. On behalf of all co-authors I thank you for accepting the manuscript for publication.

Below, your questions/recommendations are addressed one-by-one.

1. p3, line 14--> "...while in the general case..."

Corrected, thank you.

2. p4, line 5 ---> "...for a bent..."

Corrected, thank you.

3. Also, please clarify that in page 4, line 24, the $x \sim 340L$ is correct. Values of x quoted elsewhere in the manuscript (e.g Figures 1-9) are typically much smaller than $100L$.

The value 340 L is correct. Here, we talk about the location of the X-point, which stays very far downtail (see Fig.2) for all reasonable (for the Earth) dipole tilt angles and parameters of the model (7-9). To avoid any confusion, we reworded this paragraph, see p.4, lines 22 – 27.

4. Finally, while an expression of L to which results are normalised is given in eq. 17 (page 8), a similar one (but maybe with slightly different absolute value) is given in Line 8 of page 9. Can you verify that the normalisation of L is the same in both cases and if normalised x values quoted before and after equation 17 can be compared?

Yes, normalization expression, given in line 8 of page 3 (not 9) and in Eq. (17) are the same. To state it unequivocally, we include the definition, given on p.3, in Eq. (17). See p.8, line 5.