Sir,

Most of the referee's comments point out real deficiencies of our paper, and we are grateful to him/her for the improvement the paper will achieve thereby. Here are our specific replies:

1. "In dealing with geodesic perfect-fluid models, it should be mentioned that these cannot have pressure gradients (otherwise the fluid flow is not geodesic);"

A sentence saying this is now added after eq. (2.4).

2. "In the first paragraph of Section 1, the authors use the acronym "F" without identifying what it refers to – it becomes clear later that it refers to one of Flanagan's papers, but this should be identified at the outset;"

This remark is very correct. In order to avoid extensive reordering of the literature list we have now removed the first reference to "F" in section 1, and added an explanation of the "F" above eq. (4.1). In this way, "F" first appears together with the first reference to Flanagan's paper, and the literature need not be re-ordered.

3. "In section 4.1, it would be helpful if the authors further clarified the meaning of $\hat{\theta} = \theta_n$ – it gradually become clear as one proceeds with the argument, but it should be defined clearly at the beginning – σ_n and ω_n, too, as the null shear and null vorticity, respectively."

Here we do not quite understand the referee's difficulty. Each of the symbols carrying the subscript n is explained immediately after it first appears [(see below (4.3)], we quote the respective statements here:

"expansion scalar θ_n of the radiation field"

"where $\theta_n = k^{\mu}{}_{;\mu}$, σ_n and ω_n are, respectively, the expansion, shear and rotation of the null congruence"

So we ask the referee to reconsider this remark - perhaps our explanation is sufficient after all?

4. "In section 7, beginning of the 3rd paragraph, the authors refer to the metric (4.1), but equation (4.1) in their paper is not a metric!"

The equation-number referred to here should be (2.1), now corrected (thanks).

5. "It would be helpful to know whether the integration problems the authors encounter in constructing solutions through the maximum of the observer-area (angular-diameter) distance in L-T models are also encountered when other coordinate systems are exployed – e. g. for instance the fluid-ray coordinate some workers in the field have been using."

This problem persists also in the fluid-ray coordinates. We have added a footnote at the end of the second paragraph of section 8. This required adding a reference.