Response to RJ reviewers

We thank the reviewers for the time and expertise they have invested in these reviews. We have considered and addressed each point raised by the reviewers. Please find our responses to those points below.

Reviewer comments

> One page 1, after equation (2) you write that ε_i and b_i should be independent for al i,j. So it should be ε_i and b_j or it is just for i.

Thank you for catching this error. It should be “for i” and this change was made.

> One page 3, in the residual bootstrap. Since you define $\hat{r}_i$ and $\hat{e}_i$ it probably would be useful to define $\hat{b}_i$.

We added this definition.

> One page 4, in the random-effects block bootstrap. Here r_i is the same as $\hat{r}_i$ in the residual bootstrap, so a consistent naming would be helpful.

Agreed. This has been changed to $\hat{r}_i$.

> One page 4, for Uncorrelate the variance components. In 2. S* should be printed bold.

We fixed this typographic error.

> On page 5 for the definition of $\tilde{\beta}_k^*$ you sum a scalar and a vector, which is not defined from a theoretical view.

We now multiply the scalar $\widehat{\beta}_k$ by a vector of 1s.

> On the end of page 6, there is a ? where a citation did not work.

This issue has been resolved. The citation now typesets properly our local machines.

> On page 15, you write , *but this will vary for each user.* I think user should be replaced, because probably the setting or the used computer are the reason for the change.

Thank you for pointing this out. We changed this to “but this will vary based on the hardware and setting used”.