

# 1 General comments

The authors have improved the presentation and quality of the article, but a few comments remain.

## 2 Comments

1. Figure 15 shows a large difference in the energy loss whether the shear layer has moved up or down. What causes this significant difference? This variation is interesting and warrants discussion.
2. The definition of APE uses  $x_l$  and  $x_r$ . However, these are defined in terms of  $APE_f$ , which is defined in terms of APE. This appears circular. Clarity in regards to the APE density used in equation 9 should be made.
3. Please list  $U_0$  for each experiment.
4. Pg 10, line 20. How do you know that the oscillating tail appears after the amplitude-modulated wave-packet has propagated away? Could it not generate simultaneously and appear as part of the amplitude-modulated wave?
5. Pg 18, line 17. What do you mean by “far away from the mode-2 ISW”? Are the model structures being calculated at different positions behind the wave at different times? Are they not consistently placed a fixed distance behind the mode-2 ISW?
6. Pg. 20, line 15. It is not clear to me how figure 12 is connected to the energy flux. Did you mean figure 13?
7. Please confirm, but I think the authors want proportional and inversely proportional rather than positively proportional and reverse proportional, respectively. The latter have been used throughout.