

**Authors' response to the reviewers' comments**  
**(by Varotsos et al.)**

We would like to thank both referees for their fruitful reviews.  
Below we respond to their comments:

**Response to Referee #1**

We greatly appreciate his/her support to our findings. We also thank his/her positive comments to our paper.

**Response to Referee #2**

The authors would like to thank the referee for his/her valuable and positive comments that helped us to improve our manuscript. We also appreciate his/her support to our findings.

*1) Line 16: I think it is “exhibits”. The same in page 7, line 158.*

We made these corrections.

*2) Line 84: Remove the parenthesis in “Fig. 1a)”.*

We removed the parenthesis.

*3) Line 170: I think it should be “0.99 ( $\pm 0.08$ )”. The same in line 321.*

We made these changes.

*4) Line 175: Is it “1.09 ( $\pm 0.04$ )”?*

It is 1.09 ( $\pm 0.04$ ). We performed this change.

*5) Line 202: The same as before. Is it “0.91 ( $\pm 0.08$ )” and 1.20 ( $\pm 0.09$ )?*

It is “0.91 ( $\pm 0.08$ )” and 1.20 ( $\pm 0.09$ ). We made these changes.

*6) Line 213: Is it “but the fluctuations” or “but its fluctuations”?*

It is “but its fluctuations”. We performed this correction.

*7) Line 219: I also think it should be “0.99 ( $\pm 0.08$ )”, “1.09 ( $\pm 0.04$ )”.*

We also performed these changes.