

Response to Associate editor minor corrections:

- **P. 4, l.5, why a hard-return at the end?** The hard-end has been removed. The hard-return at the end of the sentence was to separate storage method the and the sponge specification as they are to different and singular steps in the method.
- **P. 4, l.24, please replace rpm with g-force. Rpm have no meaning without specification of radius, etc** rpm have been changed to g-force. Now p.4, l.23
- **P. 5, l.7, ... during an interlaboratory evaluation/assessment/study?** Study has been added, now P.5, l.6.
- **P. 6, l.15: The residual test, however, highlights... (on the one and on the other hand always go together).** Did you mean P. 8, l.15? If yes, “on the other hand” has been changed with “however”, now P.8, l.15.
- **P. 9, l.21-22: The sentence as proposed ... (see equation 2) does not make sense. Something missing here.** The sentence has been changed to “As proposed by Wille et al. (2010) the fractionation of Si isotopes by sponges, ϵ_f , can be expressed by equation 2”, now P. 9, l.21-22.
- **P.11, l.14: published.** Published has been changed to “published”, now P.11, l.14.