

Dear Katja,

Thank you for your comments. We implemented your comments and some further explanations/answers are below.

Table 1: Kept table for now, can be removed if desired.

Fig. 3:

The label in the right figure “ x/Λ_0 ” is correct. This has been discussed at the approval of the plots. I quote: “ x is the distance traversed by the simulated neutrino for one step in the G4 simulation, So, for every step, the neutrino will traverse different parts(sub-detector/material) in the detector and then we have the corresponding radiation lengths (X_0) and Interaction lengths (Λ_0) for those(sub-detectors/materials) in that step.”

This is also consistent with previous material budget plots as for instance in the Phase-1 TDR Fig. 1.5.

Fig. 32: The reason for having several points at the first entry in the right plot is that there were multiple sensors at this point and the values not averaged. Max has now produced a new version of the plots where the values are averaged. Also the x-axis of the plot has been changed to ladder number following a comment by AV.

L1339: the L1 threshold quoted here is the value reached after optimization, while the figure showed the distributions at the beginning of data taking. Since in the paper we show the threshold distribution after module testing as well as the evolution of the mean threshold as a function of luminosity (Fig. 11 and 42, respectively, in the latest version), we decided to drop Fig. 43 of v1. This also avoids the confusion.