

## Referee Report 2

I am satisfied with the modifications. However, in my previous review I failed to note that there is no mention of the study of Haro 11 by Grimes et al. (2007ApJ...668..891G). Given the discrepancy between Bergvall et al. 2006 and Grimes et al. 2007, some discussion seems warranted. At least the Grimes et al. study could be mentioned.

**Reply:** *Grimes+ 2007 is indeed a relevant paper to mention. We have now sketched the debate of Bergvall+ 2006, Grimes+ 2007 and Leitet+ 2011, and added a little word of caution about the reported LyC escape.*

This sentence has 4 commas, plus one strangely placed period. I suggest rewording.

“Knots B and C are both very strong in H, revealing that they also are producing strong Ly $\alpha$  and LyC. are also strong in intrinsic Ly $\alpha$ , but while knot C is a strong Ly $\alpha$  emitter, knot B is a strong absorber, indicating that the neutral ISM properties along the line of sight to the two knots are quite different (Hayes et al. 2009; Östlin et al. 2009).”

**Reply:** *This was a clear oversight. A residual piece of an earlier wording had not been removed, this has now been done.*

## Other changes

*Added “of Haro 11” in the first sentence of sect. 3.6 (Conclusion), because it seemed appropriate here.*