

We thank the referee for his careful reading of our paper and for his last suggestions. We have addressed in the paper the various typos and here follow the answers to the more open points the referee raises.

1. It is exactly what we meant, and we agree it was written in a somehow convoluted way (so to render it unclear), we have now changed it according to the referee's suggestions, and we hope that now the meaning is more transparent.
2. This is a typo, 4FS was meant to be matching conditions. We have now adjusted the sentence so that is correct.
3. Firstly the number was indeed a cut and paste error, the exact number is 138.8pb. Relative to the 146pb, the $4F - 4F,0$ term gives a $6 - 7\%$ increase. However, the real mean of comparison should be the bb cross-section, where the impact goes down to 0.7% (this was where our 1% came from).
4. True, we have removed this sentence.

We hope that we have addressed all the issues raised in a satisfactory way and we believe that the paper has significantly improved as a consequence of these changes.