Replies to the comments of the reviewing team:

"The paper "Identified particle production in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s}=$7 and 13 TeV measured with ALICE" is very well written and makes a fair account of existing literature. The presentation is excellent, except for the fact that Figure 1 might be a bit small to appreciate the collected data. But given the spatial limitations of the proceedings, I assume there is not much that can be done. Nevertheless, I would like the author to react on the two comments that I have concerning the paper's physical content:
1) It is actually hard to say from Figure 1 if the hardening of the p_T-spectra from low to high multiplicity classes is really stronger for baryons than for mesons. Here, I look in particular at hyperons versus pions.

>> Thanks for the comment and, indeed, I agree that this observation is a bit subtle and difficult to realize only from Figure 1. The conclusion however becomes clear if one plots the ratios of the multiplicity-binned spectra with respect to the respective multiplicity-integrated spectrum. These ratios were actually shown in slide 8 of the presentation for the highest and lowest multiplicity classes. Unfortunately, the figure with such ratios could not be included in the draft but we hope that by providing all the necessary data in Figure 1 the reader is able to easily verify the case.

2) The statement "quantitative agreement is rather poor" related to EPOS LHC sounds rather harsh to me given the results summarized in Figure 3. What I mean is: What makes DIPSY's disagreement with the low p_T range quantitatively so much more agreeable than EPOS' disagreement with the high p_T range?"

>> The objective of the statement mentioned above was, in fact, to point out that despite the similar trends presented by some models, none of them is able to quantitatively describe the data. In order to try to improve the clarity of the sentence, we have rephrased it as follows:

Original version – “An alternative description is also provided by EPOS LHC [21], which implements collective radial flow using hydrodynamics. Also in this case, predictions follow the data qualitatively, but the quantitative agreement is rather poor.”

Rephrased – “An alternative description is provided by EPOS LHC [21], which implements collective radial flow using hydrodynamics, and also follows the data qualitatively. However, none of the models tested were able to quantitatively describe the data for the two p_T regions simultaneously.”