

Dear Tom Mitcham and co-authors,

I want to sincerely thank you and your co-authors for having thoroughly addressed most comments raised by the reviewers. Unfortunately, you did not attach a track changed version of your revised manuscript (I might have missed it; the last file I can see is from April 14). So I base my judgement on the answers you directly gave to the review comments.

Thank you. In this submission we have attached a revised version of the manuscript addressing the comments of the two reviewers as well as a track changes version.

In my opinion, the most important request was on additional transient perturbation experiments to distinguish your work from predecessor studies. In the general answer to both reviewers you explain that such transient experiments require a substantial revision and expansion of the article draft. To some extent, I can understand this argument. Yet as this was a major comment from both reviewers, I suggest that your article enters a second review round to inquire their perspectives.

Thank you, we hope that we have addressed these concerns in the revised manuscript being submitted for a second round of reviews.

When uploading the revised article draft, also keep an eye out for the option to upload a manuscript version showing track changes. This will certainly facilitate the work of the reviewers. If this was no longer possible at this stage, get in touch with the editorial office to decide on the best option to make a track-changed document available.

We have now uploaded a track changes version of the revised manuscript as well.

Best,

Johannes Füst