Author's Response to minor review by Peter Veermesch

Comments

Public justification (visible to the public if the article is accepted and published): The response to the reviewer comments is satisfactory, although it is unfortunate that the authors postpone the implementation of alternatives to the mean of the ratios until a future release. I won't press on this point too hard, but I do hope that the authors keep their promise to maintain the code.

> Dear Pieter Vermeesch, thank you for your kindness to not push too hard. We have all information and papers viewed and are in the process of implementation of mean of the ratio, however, this has turned out somewhat more difficult technically than anticipated as we need to modify the input data arrays, which demands some extra work on the structure of the software. We apologize, for not directly responding, but it will be done as promised soon.

Importantly, I have now succeeded in running the software on my computer. However, I only managed to do so by deviating from the settings shown in Figure 1. There is no folder called "example data" in the "example data for analysis" folder of the supplementary data. There is a folder called "data", but the software crashes when I use this. I had better luck after selecting the top-level "example data for analysis" folder. I don't know if this changed behaviour is related to modifications made to the code after the manuscript. In any case, Figure 1 probably needs updating.

> We apologize for this inconvenience. In fact, you found the correct solution, and we have now changed the screen shot of Figure 1 accordingly. We have also further revised the numbering of figure 1 and 4 in two places. We sincerely hope the article is now ready for publication and thanks you ones again for the time and helpful comments that significantly improved the manuscript.