When you write that you pooled years "in order to maximize the power of our estimation", this is not correct. One uses a statistical model that represents the processes generating the data - if there was a large variability between years, it would be wrong to ignore it, that is pooling the data would lead to a model underestimating the uncertainty (and for example leading to too small P-values or equivalently too narrow confidence intervals). You can argue that based on the data the variability between years is small and therefore the model provides a description of the general pattern, but one does not choose a model in order to get a small P-value. Note also that with respect to estimation, it is precision and/or accuracy which are relevant, power is with regards to hypothesis testing.

We acknowledge that this formulation is inappropriate and we have removed it in the new version of the manuscript. The existence of site-specific seasonal patterns was assumed and our aim in this publication was to describe these patterns, as stated in the introduction (L 98 - L99). We argue that such an approach is relevant and supported by the data on seasonal evolution of transformed tick abundance (figure 2), showing for each site a stability of the patterns between the different years of data collection, also underlined in the text (L 205 - 206). What we initially meant was that having several years of data allows to represent the extent to which individual observations vary around the modelled seasonal expectations, which is different from statistical power understood as the probability to detect an effect when it exists. We hope that removing the reference to power from this sentence has clarified what we meant.

The wrong indices in the equation of the model have been corrected.