We thank the referee for his or her helpful comments. As a note to the editor, some of these errors arose because we were unable to view the revised compiled pdf on the ApJL submission website — we only had access to our own pre-compiled version. We wanted to point this out to help authors avoid mistakes like this in the future.

Our responses are given in italics below:

****

I fully agree that having both the results of Heller+ (2019) and yours in the literature is worthwhile; in particular given the fact that their analysis of the HST data does suggest a drop in the light curve that is similar to the one interpreted by TK18 as an exomoon, whereas you suggest that the kink is not significant. The new reference in Sect. 5 doesn't seem to have been successfully included by your LaTeX compiler. It also doesn't appear in the "REFERENCES" section.

Fixed!

****

The legend of Fig. 2 has not been modified, unfortunately. Maybe you included an old version of the figure in to the revised manuscript?

Also fixed.

****

Sect. 1, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: "potential ... candidate" sounds like a tautology. It should be either "possible exomoon" or "exomoon candidate".

We removed the word "potential", so the sentence now reads "Recently, an exomoon candidate was identified…"

****

I am afraid this definition of the moon's inclination is insufficient or contradictory. In the literature, the definition of the orbital inclination (i_p) usually refers to the angle between the normal to the line of sight and the orbital plane of the planet. Now if your inclination of the moon orbit (i_m) is "defined relative to that of the planet", then this wording suggests that i_m = 90 degrees means an angle of 90 degrees with respect to i_p. I think this is not what you mean. I think what you mean is that the moon's inclination is defined relative to the normal to the line of sight. But I'm not sure. Moreover, if the moon's inclination were defined relative to i_p, and if, say, i_p = 85 degrees so that the planet (not necessarily Kepler-1625b) would barely be transiting the star, then i_m = 90 degrees could have one of the two following meanings but not both at the same time:
(i) either the moon transits its planet with an impact parameter of 0 but then i_m cannot be defined relative to i_p
(ii) or i_m is defined relative to i_p but the moon does not transit its planet with an impact parameter of 0.
Please clarify!

We apologize for the confusion regarding the moon's inclination. The referee is in fact correct: the inclination of both the planet and the moon is defined relative to the line of sight. We have verified that this is the convention in REBOUND, which planetplanet wraps to perform the orbital calculations. To validate this, the attached plot shows the absolute positions of the planet and moon in a plane perpendicular to the plane of the sky when the planet is at quadrature computed with planetplanet. In this frame, the observer is to the left at z = -infty and north on the sky is up along the +y axis. This is therefore a sideways view of the orbit (at quadrature), with the star located at the origin.

*The different panels correspond to different planet inclinations, and the different line colors correspond to different moon inclinations. The orbital path of the planet is the dashed black line. Inspection of the figure shows that the moon's inclination is **not** defined relative to that of the planet. In particular, when the two inclinations are the same (blue line in the top left panel, orange line in the top right panel, green line in the bottom left panel, red line in the bottom right panel), the orbits are coplanar. This means that the inclinations are both defined relative to the same plane (in this case, the plane of the sky). We thank the reviewer for helping us clarify this point. We have revised the description of the moon inclination in the paper to clarify that it is defined relative to the line of sight. We note that regardless of what prior range of inclinations we choose — either varying freely from 0 - 90, or the initial overly restrictive range of inclinations we used, 89.7 - 90 deg, the constraints on the moon radius and transit time are unchanged.*