We thank the reviewer for this very detailed review and the intensive work he or she has put into our manuscript. Nevertheless we have to make a case in favor of our paper. The criticism regarding the design and writing style is not shared by the authors of the three other reviewers/comments. We take the liberty of following the suggestions made by the other reviewers regarding these points and focus on the scientific critique voiced by this reviewer. That being said, we agree with many of the scientific points raised in this review. Indeed our point of view from an outsider of the field, that enabled us to come up with these novel experiments, is hindering us from the comprehensive synthesis of the literature. Here a revised version of the manuscript will be carefully improved by us, since we agree with the critique made by the reviewer in this point: a complete reference of the previously published literature is needed.

After reading many of the detailed points posted by this reviewer, we feel they are valid. We thank him or her for pointing them out, so a revised manuscript can be updated to a much better version of a scientific paper. We will include the suggestions made here. Last but not least we would like to thank the reviewer for the observation that these kind of equilibrium experiments are indeed new and can add to the literature published before. Since we share this feeling, a revised manuscript will be prepared very carefully by us, if we are given the chance to do so.