Dear PC,

we have here some remaining comments to the last version of the manuscript:

line 46: missing dot after the sentence

line 569: delete one Collaboration (there is ALICE Collaboration Collaboration)

Also, I have found some things which I have not peviously spotted. They might be correct, though. I am not certain about them due to my lack of english or expertise. I would like to ask you to check them if they are relevant before sending them to Jesse:

line 35 and 36: either subjects or interacts (i.e. add one “s")

lines 84 and 85: "For TOF PID, the particle mass was used to calculate the expected time of flight as a function of track length and momentum." - I think the particle time of flight (and consequently velocity) was used to determine the mass (i.e. to identify particle).

line 181: "P is the total pair momentum” - P itsself is not a part of the formula. It is there as index in S_P(r*), but this is explained as “the pair source distribution”.

lines 237 and 344: technically, lambda_Fit is in equation 7, not in equation 6. But we can say implicitly it is in equation 6 ?

equation 9: are different indices necessary (alpha and beta)? I.e. can we change them to i and j ?

line 280: whose -> their ?

line 330: to treating -> for treating ?

Figure 4: the predictions [10,11] are done for KLam, i.e. not for each K (K+, K-, K0S) separately. Can we then claim in lines 410 and 411 that the are inconsistent with LamK+ ?

Table 5: maybe we can cite MINUIT (or ROOT?)?

About the answer to the referees:

There is only one comment :

It seems to me that it is not good to write about resonances in the simulation which we did not see in the data. These resonances(if they exist) looks like resonances with very small width. Such a width is unreasonable if we have finite momentum resolution. I propose to skip(rewrite) this sentence in the answer.

For the rest we agree with the proposed answers.