Dear Dr. Mäkelä,

I have now received two reports of the revised version of your paper. The referees are the same as those of the first version, with the same identification numbers.

Both referees consider your paper can now be accepted for publication. Referee 2 mentions a few editing corrections (the line and page numbers that the referee mentions for those corrections do not correspond to either one of the two versions of your revised paper I have, but I think you will have no difficulty in finding where to make the corrections).

I add as editor a few additional corrections that I think desirable.

1. P. 7, ll. 12-13, *In a case that the parameter chains converge to a limit of a predescribed range* … From what I understand, … *converge to a <u>bound of an a prori prescribed</u> range* … would be preferable.

2. Abstract, l. 6, … *possible parameter<u>s</u>, …*

3. Abstract, l. 12. Expand explicitly the acronyms GPP and ET.

4. Caption of Figure 1. *The contours correspond to* […] *normal distribution*. Do you mean *normalized* (but not Gaussian !) ?

5. P. 8, l. 18 (and p. 12, l. 27), what is the *coefficient of determination* (the correlation coefficient) ?

6. P. 7, l. 22, … *the <u>squared</u> weights sum up to one*

Please make the corrections suggested by referee 2 as well as by myself. If you decide not to make a particular correction, say why.

I thank you for having chosen *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics* for publishing your paper, and look forward to receiving the final version.

Olivier Talagrand

Editor, *Nonlinear Processes in Geophysics*