

Dear Chris Chambers,

Thank you for your favorable reply. We addressed the last suggestion concerning the reporting of excluded data and updated the manuscript accordingly.

Sincerely and on behalf of the co-authors,

Lisa Reisinger

Reviewer 1 (Pia Brinkmann):

The authors addressed all my comments with sufficient depth and improved their manuscript accordingly. Therefore, I have no further comments.

We appreciate your favorable evaluation and thank you for your constructive input to improve our manuscript.

Reviewer 2 (Will Sedley):

I am satisfied with the authors' responses to all reviewers' points, and with their revisions.

Thank you very much for your valuable feedback to revise and improve our manuscript.

Reviewer 3 (Emilie Cardon):

I wish to thank the authors for their detailed replies and adjustments to the manuscript.

I have just one remaining minor suggestion regarding the reporting of the MEG preprocessing. I appreciate the authors' clarification that the removal and interpolation of bad channels is implemented within the Maxfilter algorithm. In analogy with my suggestion of reporting the number of removed ICA components for each group, I would also suggest reporting the number of removed and interpolated channels for each group, again to ensure that the number of removed channels does not substantially differ across groups.

I have no further questions or suggestions.

Thank you for your favourable evaluation. We appreciate your comment and agree with you on the importance of providing information regarding group differences. We added to the manuscript that we will report the number of interpolated channels for each group.

Page 16:

Additionally, the Maxfilter algorithm will detect bad channels, remove and interpolate the data. **We will report the number of interpolated channels for each group to highlight whether there are substantial differences between the tinnitus and control group.**