

I thank the authors for this new version of their paper. I consider it can now be accepted from the scientific point of view. But there remain a number of points to be improved as concerns the edition of the paper. Here are examples (the line numbers are those of file Authors\_tracked\_changes.pdf)

1. In response to a comment by Referee #2, the authors now mention how the Nature Run has been produced (ll. 123-124). However, that is done as a passing remark when describing how ‘observations’ have been obtained. And the specific notation of the Run ( $x_t^{NR}$ ) is introduced only on l. 230.

I think all information on the Nature Run should be introduced in the first place it is mentioned (ll. 115-116).

2. Ll. 252-253, *Miyoshi and Sun [...] conducted experiments [...] for 40 different initial conditions*. Did those 40 different initial conditions correspond to 40 different Nature Runs, or what ?

3. Similarly, ll. 270-271, *The initial values of the system were set ...* This now refers to experiments performed with MPC. I understand that these initial values were not those of the Nature Run. But what were they exactly ? How do they differ from the 40 initial values of Miyoshi and Sun (which are again used for MPC, as mentioned on l. 285)

4. The value of the observation period  $T_a$  (which I understand is always  $T_a = 8$  steps) is not mentioned in Table 1.

5. L. 232, ... *the state transition from time  $t + k$  to time  $t + k + 1$*

These are only examples. I suggest that the authors check carefully their paper for possible inconsistencies, ambiguities or inaccuracies.