We are grateful to all referees for careful review of our manuscript. We are glad that all three recommend the publication and in the following respond to the comments and questions raised by the referees. We modify the manuscript in accordance with most of the recommendations and hope that the paper is now suitable for publication in JOVE.

**Reviewer #1**

The main concern of Reviewer #1 is the Fig.6. The purpose of Fig.6 is to illustrate the performance of the system. We do actually observe signatures of the gap opening as shift of the leading edges of the spectra. This is a conventional presentation of ARPES data showing the opening of the gap. We could not, however, exclude that this shift is the temperature effect and therefore described it accordingly in the text. The latter however does not compromise the performance of the system. We would therefore like to keep this figure.

1. Yes, the temperature is measured during the experiments. We have added to the protocol a corresponding sentence when showing the temperature.
2. We intentionally kept kinetic energy and angle in some of the plots to illustrate that the raw data are collected exactly in these coordinates. We hope it is clear from the text that binding energy and momentum can be re-calculated afterwards.
3. We would like to keep the Fig.1 in its present form as it represents a realistic setup.
4. We have mentioned other materials in the abstract in the revised version.

**Reviewer #2**

Major Concern

We have followed the recommendation of the referee and added a reference to the well-known textbook.

Minor Concern

We have explained the term “uncertainty” in the footnote of the amended version of the manuscript.

We have changed the title and mentioned the word “photoemission”.

**Reviewer #3**

Major Concerns

1. The paper describes a particular method to determine the electronic structure of solids. It is though based on the very general photoemission technique, which we described in order to introduce the reader to the subject. We did not aim to introduce ARPES as a general technique, but only an ultra-low temperature modification of it.
2. Yes, the paper describes only our work.

Minor Concerns

1. Again, we did not intend to give an overview of what kind of ARPES equipment is available in the world. We fully realize that taken apart, some of the numbers can be better. The advantage of our approach is the combined resolution and temperature which, to our best knowledge, have no rivals so far.
2. We added required clarification as a second footnote.
3. We have modified this sentence according to the suggestion of the referee.
4. We are pretty sure this is true, but we added “perhaps” to soften the statement.
5. We meant exactly the possibility to change pass energy, which is necessary if one wants to “explore the broad binding energy range as well as wide regions of the reciprocal space with unprecedented detail”.
6. We are pretty sure it was indeed the first superconducting oxide after the cuprates.
7. Here the referee cites one of our own works. The other paper reports symmetrized data, which we always avoid to perform and present instead only raw data.
8. We agree, and used very accurate wording when describing Fig.6. As mentioned earlier, much more work is needed to unambiguously resolve the gaps in this very complicated material.
9. We are not quite sure what exactly is meant here. Presumably a very insignificant for a general reader detail (the order of the traces should perhaps be inverted).
10. We have modified Fig.5 as requested.