Dear Dr. Endl,

We thank you for your continued consideration of our paper. We are also appreciative that the referee has found our revisions sufficient to merit publication, and thank them for their detailed responses.

Below, we have reproduced the referee's second set of comments, along with our point-by-point responses. We have performed two of the referee's three suggestions; the third is no longer applicable given the nature of the revision performed in our first iteration.

Best regards,

Luke Bouma

################################################################################

Reviewer's Comments:

I would like to thank the authors for addressing my major concerns. The unchanged conclusion, regarding the best-fitting model to the measured minimum times, after analyzing the influence of non-full phase coverage transits and with spot-crossing events have provided much more confident in the final results. I believe the paper is of sufficient quality in science to be published in AJ. I do not need to see a final version of the manuscript, but I would appreciate if the authors could address the following 3 minor concerns:

1) In Section 2.3, the reference for the Yonsei Yale isochrones was correctly incorporated in the text, but the references for Gaia DR2, Tycho-2, APASS, 2MASS, and WISE catalogs are still missing.

> These surveys / catalogs have now been cited in the "Facility" section at
> the end of the paper. Thank you.

2) In the caption of Figure 4, it is recommendable to specify what "binned TESS" data mean by adding the same sentence that the authors added in Figure 3, "The binned TESS point is the weighted average of 18 TESS transits".

> Done.

3) The sentence "The two models may begin to diverge in the mid-2020s" that should appear in Caption of Figure 7 is missing.

> Between the first and second submissions, we added a set of dashed lines to
> Figure 7. The dashed lines show that a subset of the apsidal precession
> models -- those with k2<0.75 -- are already diverging in the occultation
> times. This is described in paragraph 2 of section 4.2. Given this
> nuance, we would prefer to keep this sentence omitted, as it is no longer
> the most immediately relevant point.