

Dear authors, your manuscript will have to undergo a second round of review. But before this is initiated, please complete the answer to the first review first. I could not find the answer to the last of remarks of reviewer #1 on the page C4 of RC1.

Also I believe, that you missed part of the first question of reviewer #2.

In my understanding, the reviewers raised critical points which you did not answer. If I am wrong, please point me to the answers to these questions.

In the process of checking your answers to the referees, please check again, if you completed the review.

Kind regards
Mathias Palm

Thank you for pointing us to some of the comments that we had missed before.

Firstly, we have now addressed the comments on page C4 of Reviewer #1 in Part 2 of our response, which we have posted in the discussion. The comments we had missed did not require additional changes to the manuscript, so that we have uploaded the same version again.

Secondly, you mention we did not fully address reviewer #2's opening statement. While we do not explicitly address each minor aspect, I think we do address the main concerns as best as we can by further elaborating on our choices. If you feel that we still need to address a specific aspect of the reviewers' comments, please let us know.

The bottom line of our response is that we cannot change the design of the study at this point. Instead, we have added new material to support our choices in the revisions. Here we honestly report convergence problems. If these convergence problems are a fundamental reason to not publish our results, then there is little we can do at this point. However, we think this would be a mistake, because there is still much value in the results we present. On top of that, our experience should be known to anyone that will attempt to perform a similarly meticulous inversion of MCF.