I thank the authors for their work to make the manuscript better. I think that great improvements have been made. I still have some minor suggestions to improve the readability and make the paper more understandable for the general reader.

1. I am confused by the use of parentheses as a way to soften the meaning of words or to make some of the words feel "optional". According to my understanding such use of parentheses is not considered good style. Please consider removing the parentheses in sentences such as P18L16 "we also see frequent (very) stable conditions". I think that here "we also see frequent stable or very stable conditions" is much more precise.
2. The overbar in $\bar{\theta}_v$ in formula (5) is hard to see. Please check that this gets corrected in the final proof.
3. I would suggest adding a subscript for the symbol for the reference height z in (6), to avoid confusing that with the z in formula (2), where z has the meaning of a coordinate.
4. I think that some additional sentences are still needed in describing the sample normalization procedure (P6L16-L19), because I still struggled to understand the details. I would suggest explicitly defining reference wind velocity for each sample as the wind speed and direction of that sample at 100 m height, explicitly noting that each sample has its own reference wind velocity, because my first association is that "reference" is something that is common for all samples. I would suggest rephrasing P6L17 as "the value of the perpendicular component of the wind speed profile is 0 for each sample and for all averaged profiles".
5. Caption of Figure 8. I would suggest: "In the hodograph, the lowest level is indicated by the dotted line connecting the lowest level to the origin of coordinates".
6. I would rephrase the statement that MMIJ-5 has "relatively large deviations from logarithmic profile" P9L21, because later authors state that its shape is well described by unstable logarithmic profile, similarly in the caption for Figure 8 I would like it to be pointed out that these are stability adjusted logarithmic fits. I am stressing this point because a slightly distracted reader might confuse what exactly is meant by "logarithmic profile" because in some cases this term describes only the neutrally stable profile shape.