Thank you very much for taking the time to review our article. We have addressed each of your concerns as follows:

- a) ...However, even if the stated uncertainty on alpha_r and the sensitivity of the result to this uncertainty are both small, this evaluation of lifetimes has a mixed theory-experiment character and this should be made more clear.

To make this fact more clear, we specifically mentioned that our calculated f, τ, D, and S values were calculated using measured polarizabilities and theoretical residual polarizabilities in 3 more places:
1) the caption of Table 2
2) the beginning of the paragraph in which Table 2 is first referenced
3) the paragraph after that

- probable misprint in table 4 for delta alpha_r(0) of Rb

It was a misprint. Changed “130” to “30”

- bottom of page 5: the summation includes not only excitation to discrete states labeled by n' but also the continuum.

This is true—thank you for pointing this out. We also realized that our statement was also incorrect in that it implied that only n-p transitions were taken into account in alpha_v'. We corrected this statement.

- misprints in lines 107 and 109, in line 144
- line 160: alpha_r(0) and alpha_r(I omega): 2nd r is missing

Fixed. Thank you for spotting these typographical errors.

- page 9: the statement that the VdW coefficients C_8 and C_10 can be predicted based on alpha(0) measurements is strongly puzzling !

You're right, we did not demonstrate at all in this paper how to infer C_8 and C_10 coefficients from alpha(0) measurements and theory. We removed this confusing statement.

- eq 22: omega_D3 appears several times. If the D line has 3 components, this is a great news!!!

Haha yes, the little-known alkali D3 line. Thanks for noticing that.