

Author Responses to Editor Comments

We would like to thank the Editor for the thorough review of our manuscript and suggestions made. We have revised the manuscript based on the Editor's suggestions and comments. We reply to each of the comments below. Our changes in the paper are in blue below, and the line numbers and sections refer to the revised manuscript:

| Editor Comment | Author Comment |
|---|---|
| While I do share some of the concerns with reviewer 1 and believe this need be addressed to make further progress on this front in the future, GC takes a more "pragmatic" approach to sharing discovery (not strictly requiring to dive deep into the underlying theory to explain an signal/observation as long as robust quantitative or qualitative observations are being made). I do believe that this exploratory study is of value provided honest and correct framing (which authors have already improved during revision). However, the authors have not fully addressed comments by reviewer 3 regarding length and conciseness. While the authors have pointed out in their response that they worked on the conciseness of statements, the tracked-changes document shows more additions than deletions in the document, making the manuscript even longer. The impact of this on the use(fulness) of the manuscript is not to be underestimated, and I agree with the reviewer that parts of the manuscript could be "shortened considerably". I encourage the authors to go through the manuscript, consider carefully what information is needed, identify information that may be non-essential to the manuscript's message, and shorten it accordingly. Examples of where text could be shortened include (but are not restricted to): | <p>We thank the referee and editor for their feedback about the length of the manuscript. We have thorough revised the manuscript to reduce the length. We outline below how we have done so, and our deletions & revisions are shown clearly in the track changed version of our manuscript.</p> <p>We also have moved the Appendix to the Supplement to shorten the manuscript as well.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Section 1.1 could be shortened to a third if condensed to information that is essential to communicating the work. 2. Much of the information in the 1st paragraph of "Materials and methods" may not be needed to understand this study. Simultaneously, other information readers may initially be looking for, such as sample size, should be displayed more prominently. By being more concise, the section could probably be reduced to 1/2 or 2/3 of its current length. <p>I appreciate that this may be a challenge but keeping the text to-the-point and concise will enhance clarity, accessibility and ultimately the usefulness of the study to the community. A colleague who was not directly involved in the write up may be able to help identify essential and non-essential information.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have shortened Section 1.1 (L25 to L44) and 1.2 (L45 to L54). 2. We have re-structured and shortened the first paragraphs on the Materials and Methods section (L94 to L115). We have put information about sample size on L108 to make it more prominent for the readers. |
| <p>Other points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make sure you point out the methods are not entirely comparable as they communicate different aspects (see reviewer 1 comment). In a carefully set up (future) experiment, the number of free parameters should be minimised. 2. The authors end the abstract with "The offset correlation will likely be more useful [...]". Given the exploratory nature of the study and the sample size problems highlighted by the reviewers, I recommend adding a note about the need of a more in-depth study (with larger sample size, fewer free parameters, etc.) to really say this with confidence. | <p>We thank the editor for the following suggestions and have addressed them:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have made this clear in the abstract see L13 to L15, also on L87 to L90 in the Introduction. 2. We have added the following sentence at the end of the abstract, L22 to L23 “However, given the exploratory nature of this study, and the small sample size, there is need for more in-depth study with a larger sample size and fewer parameters to explore this further.” |