Dear Colleague,

Two referees have submitted their reviews of the revised version of your paper. They are the same referees as those of the first version, with the same identification numbers. In particular, referee 1, who had already let his name known, is Alban Farchi, from CEREA École des Ponts ParisTech in France.

As concerns Referee 2, he/she writes *The authors have addressed all of my comments. The manuscript has improved substantially with the added figures.* He/she recommends acceptance of the paper as it is.

A. Farchi is more critical, and makes a number of comments and suggestions, of actually unequal importance. He mentions that some of your results are in contradiction with results obtained by other authors in similar circumstances. This must certainly be mentioned in your paper. But it may be very difficult, if not impossible, to explain those contradictions. That may actually require additional experiments, either by you or the concerned authors. So do mention those contradictions and discuss them in the light of what you have done, as well as what you can tell concerning the other authors.

One of A. Farchi's comments is that he finds that your conclusion is too succinct. It is certainly succinct and, if you think you can say more (for instance, as concerns the possible limitations of your approach, or as to which difficulties could be expected in large dimension systems), please do so.

A. Farchi makes a number of editing comments. I as editor have also comments. There are actually a fairly large number of inconsistencies of notations, as well as typos. In addition to those that are mentioned by A. Farchi, I have noticed the following ones

1. L. 44, … *conditioned by the forecast* … I understand the forecast is X^f. Say it explicitly.

2. I do not see the usefulness of putting indices to the symbol π when the latter designates a probability distribution. Those indices do not seem to bring any information that is not contained in the first of the arguments of π. Not only that is useless, but it even brings confusion. What is the meaning of the index $Y|X$ in $\pi_{Y|X}$ in Eq. (1) ? Why not simply π_Y (see also the lines 44-45 that follow) ?

3. Why use X^f in Eq. (1) and $\wedge X^f$ in Eq. (2) ? What is the difference, if any ? (same remark concerning X^a in Eqs 1 and 3).

4. Eq. (4) $\pi_P (P | X^f_j) \rightarrow \pi_X (X^f_j | P)$

5. Eq. (5). Subscript j on rhs is useless (and confusing) (incidentally, I do not understand the presence of the denominator $1 - w^{a,\mathrm{T}} w^{a,}$ in that equation. A brief explanation could be useful).

6. Eq. 7). Second sum runs from $j=1$ to N^a.

7. Eq. (9). $\mathbf{X}^f_k \rightarrow \mathbf{X}^a_k$ (see also Eq. 14)

8. Eq. (11), argument of the exponential. $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^{-1}$

9. Eq. (12). Symbol o not defined (defined only on occasion of Eq. 46)

10. L. 357, *lead → led*

The list above is certainly not exhaustive. Please revise your paper, taking all A. Farchi's comments and suggestions, as well as my own, into account. Check in particular carefully and systematically all equations in the paper. And (except for minor typing corrections) answer precisely to all of our comments and suggestions. Should you disagree with a particular comment, or decide not to follow a particular suggestion, please state precisely your reasons for that.

I look forward to receiving a new version of your paper. I may send it to A. Farchi for an additional advice.