

I thank the authors for the improvements in version 4 of their manuscript. Unfortunately, I do still see some adjustments needed in regard to two of the points raised in my comments on version 3.

Page 5, last paragraph:

AUTHORS: We tried to describe what we did to enable the reader to adopt such a test. To address your comments, we have re-worded the whole paragraph.

I still see some need for additional clarification of the method. Especially the part on model selection in the last line of page 5 remains unclear. If “a Gaussian linear mixed model” is used, where does the model selection come in there (“a” model implies for me there is only one, so where is the choice made? Or is “model” used here in a different meaning?).

In the first lines of page 6 I still do not understand what the whole concept of terms entering the model is about. Why does sequence matter? My guess would be that it is about linear terms explaining a certain part of the probability but the reader is still left guessing.

Page 6, lines 24-30:

AUTHORS: These analyses still wait to be done. The description shows the potential of the method. I have added more background on the relevance of such information. Good point, thank you.

Please add a sentence clarifying that the analysis will be done for more birds in a separate study.

After addressing these points the manuscript should be ready for publication.