

Editor:

**However, I noticed that you changed the order of the authors of the paper (the 3rd author on the previous version of the paper became the lead author) and you added a 4th author. Before I can proceed with accepting your paper, I need to have a clear and convincing motivation why these changes in the authorship were proposed. This also begs the question why you did not use your final list of authors in the original version of the paper.**

Reply:

Dear Editor:

The reasons leading to the original list of were mainly to promote the PhD student (F. Fischer) who had done large parts of the analysis. The principal investigator of the project (R. Brandhuber) was only mentioned in the Acknowledgements. During writing and even more during revision it turned out that most of the work load rested on the corresponding author (listed as senior author). We hence decided to add the principal investigator as senior author and to move the former senior author in the front position.

We usually quantify the contributions of authors according to the following seven categories: concept / funds / data / analysis / background and interpretation / writing / revision. Averaged over these categories (with data analysis being weighted more in this case) the contribution of authors was as follows: KA 48% (equally contributing to all categories), FF 22% (mainly contributing to data analysis), TW 24% (mainly providing the data), RB 4% (mainly providing the funding). The remaining 3% were contributed by four other persons, three of them being mentioned in the Acknowledgements.

Karl Auerswald