Dear Editor,

first of all we would like to thank the referee for her/his report and especially for her/his helpful suggestions. In the attachment you can find the response from the referee to our recent submission.

In this letter we would like to appeal against the rejection of the referee and point out that our paper is suitable for JHEP. First we would like to address the two suggestions from the referee:

We have increased the error of the triple-gluon condensate and also corrected the corresponding uncertainties of our three parameters $\lambda^2_{E,H}$ and $\mathcal{R}$. The other suggestion pointed out that the vacuum saturation approximation to estimate the dimension seven condensate is strongly violated. It is true that the dimension seven contribution is essential for the sum rule of λ^2_E. However, as we emphasized in the paper, the parameter λ^2_H is our main result due to the stability of the sum rule regardless of the strong violation of dimension seven contribution. One way to compensate the rough estimate of dimension seven condensate would be to increase the uncertainty, which has been done in our recent version of our submission.

In the end, the uncertainties of λ^2_E and $\mathcal{R}$ are unchanged due to the 100 % uncertainty that they already have. However, a significant change of the uncertainty of λ^2_H can be observed from +- 0.02 to +-0.05.

Next we would like to address the main reason for the rejection of our submission. In the referee report it is mentioned that the calculation of the work is useful, but it is referred to as a "re-analysis" of [3],[24] and our diagonal correlation function approach to estimate the desired parameters $\lambda^2_{E,H}$ is labelled as "standard method".

From our perspective QCD sum rules have certainly been used many times in the literature and diagonal positive definite correlation functions have been considered, but to our knowledge this is the first time to use a diagonal correlation function to investigate the B-meson light-cone distribution amplitudes. We have explicitly shown the advantages and disadvantages of this new approach. Therefore, in this context we would declare our analysis not as a standard method. Furthermore, we also disagree that our work is a re-analysis of [3] and [24]. Although the authors of [3], [24] calculated these parameters, the values differed by nearly a factor of three. From our colleagues we know that the difference of the values from [3] and [24] was surprising and one of our personal goal was to understand the reason for this huge difference. Thus, it was timely to obtain independent parameters by approaching the problem with a diagonal correlation function. We also understood why the values of [3] and [24] differed by a factor of three, which we explained in our work.

In conclusion, we are very grateful for the suggestions of the referee which improved our work and also her/his personal opinion. However, we strongly believe that our work is suitable for JHEP and we hope that we were able

to explain the situation from our perspective.

Yours sincerely,

M. Wald and M. Rahimi