Editorial: Gonzalez

Thanks for your submission; both reviewers and the editor were enthusiastic about your highly original submission. Before proceeding with publication, please address comments by the two reviewers, as well as the editorial feedback below. Overall the results are nice, but lack a clear interpretation in terms of the parameters of your model an therefore more insights should be provided as to what Fig. 2 is telling us about the system.

* First line 3rd paragraph, you might replace “difficult” with “computational”
* Text in paragraph above Fig.2 – random runs can be reproduced by saving the seed value, so you should in principle be able to reproduce exactly any given run of your model so long as you save the seed.
* The editor agrees with Reviewer 2’s assessment of the results. It is not obvious from the results presented that the distributions in Fig. 2 a-c are really represent distinct results, or if instead they are representing individual runs sampled from a wide distribution of TE scaling values. This is particularly true comparing A and C (and illuminated by the fact that B falls in between these). I am therefore not convinced that one could make the claim based on the data presented that these are indeed distinct distributions. Further insights into the system, and what leads to these different scaling distributions would be informative. Since it seems you have data on avg. delay for airports each day and also there relative distances it would be good to compare to the distributions of TE calculated. For example, are high TE pairs close in spatial proximity or not? Is that consistent for all the distributions plotted? What is the average delay of the highest ranked node pairs, for the source node? Lowest? Does this provide any insights into the patterns you observe.
* To gain further insights, you might also consider calculating the active information for your network and analyzing relative to the same system metrics (but prioritize analyzing the TE first).