Dear Editor,

We thank you and the undisclosed reviewers for reviewing our manuscript and for the favorable decision. We revised the manuscript according to the comments of the second reviewer:

Reviewer 1 (Anonymous) - Comments for the author

Thank you

Reviewer 2 (Anonymous) - Comments for the author

Briefly, we addressed all issues highlighted in the pdf in accordance with your recommendations. Thank you for improving the quality and consistency of our article very much.

ABSTRACT
page2#31: the p-value was added
page2#35: the technical performance data was added to the results section
page2#36: the inconsistency of this statement was corrected in Fig. 6.

BODY
INTRODUCTION
page3#52: Corrected

MATERIALS AND METHODS
page5#108: Corrected
page5#117: Corrected

RESULTS
page6#133: Corrected
page6#143: The inconsistency of this statement was corrected in Fig. 6.

DISCUSSION
page8#195: same as previous: The inconsistency of this statement was corrected in Fig. 6.
page9#217: Thank you. We took the liberty to use the wording that you suggested.

FIGURE LEGENDS
page15#322 (D): *** in D explained now in the chart
page15#324: Corrected
page15#328: IMR in general (solid and dashed orange lines in Fig. 1C) and even HIR-SD to be precise – it is now corrected.
Page21#359: asterisks now explained in the chart (b)
Page22#364: Corrected
Page22#365: Corrected

Page22#365: Corrected
Page22#367: Corrected both in text and in graph 6c.

Thank you again for choosing our manuscript for publication and improving its quality. Should there be any further suggestions, we would be delighted to address them.

On behalf of the authors, sincerely,
Lukas Lambert