

2nd review of “Diurnal mesospheric tidal winds observed simultaneously by meteor radar in Costa Rica and Cariri” by Buriti et al.

I appreciate the author’s effort to address my questions and comments in my first review. The paper is greatly improved and scientifically sound. It would make the paper more insightful if the author could utilize GSWM09 to discuss a little more about the different diurnal tidal wind behaviors at these two sites. For example, the author could generate contour plots of tidal wind amplitude seasonal variations for the migrating tide DW1 and nonmigrating tide DE2 and DE3 at these two locations. This may help identifying the driving force of the distinct tidal wind seasonal changes at CR and CA, making the discussion more completed. The model should have the outputs for these diurnal tidal components.

Some minor comments:

Line 42, Not sure what “These two mechanisms” are. Please specify.

Line 53-55, please provide the reference on this statement.

Line 93, remove “this software” and replaced it with “it”.

Line 101, please consider to replace “not exactly coincident with” with “closest to” .

Line 102, delete “but they close”.

Line 105, delete “will here”.

Line 107, “Data in February and March are missing for CR” due to...? Please specify.

Line 146, replace “between the” with “for both”.

Line 168, please consider to replace “height was quite higher” with “was considerably larger than the model outputs”.

Line 169, replace “Month” with “The results”.

Line 170, replace “seems to approach to” with “generally agree with”.

Line 171-172, please consider to delete “also presented” and modify the sentence as “showed a large blue area in November-January which indicates....”.

Line 175-176, delete “of the two,”.

Line 179, add “some” in front of “interesting results”.

Line 182, add “with long vertical wavelength” after “non-migrating tide”.

Line 189-190, “show evidence of model...”. I am not sure I fully understand this statement. Please consider to rephrase.

Line 192, about the difference between the model and experimental results, considering the uncertainties in both the measurement and the model, these are not big differences and not unacceptable.

Line 215, replace “observational” with “radar”.

Line 240, Should be “The geographic conditions”.

Line 243, delete “could effects”.

Line 245, delete “to be”.