

Three referees have sent their reports on the latest version of the paper. Referees 1 and 2 are the same ones as those of previous version. In particular, referee 1 is still Ricardo Todling. Referee 3, whom I had solicited in order to get an additional opinion, is an expert of the estimation methods that are studied in the paper.

R. Todling writes that he is satisfied with the revision and recommends acceptance of the paper as it stands.

Referee 3 considers that the paper is of significant scientific interest and is worth publishing. He only asks for minor revisions, which all bear on editing aspects.

Referee 2 is more critical. He had written in his previous review that he had difficulties in understanding exactly what the authors had done. He writes that he finds now the paper much easier to understand. He has no criticism on the basic science, but he nevertheless writes that two aspects need significant modifications. He considers that the 'optimality' claimed by the authors as to their approach is unjustified. And he also considers that Section 5, which presents results of numerical experiments, is difficult to understand and requires substantial rewriting. He also adds a number of suggestions on editing aspects.

Please revise your paper according to the recommendations of referees 2 and 3. Please respond to all of these recommendations. In case you disagree with, or decide not to follow, one of them, please state precisely your reasons for that.

Not being a native English speaker, I am not fully qualified for commenting on the language, but it is clear that it needs improvements. Referee 3 makes a number of suggestions in this respect. The paper, if it is accepted, will go through copy-editing by the technical editor. But it is preferable to correct it as much as possible at the present stage. Please check the language systematically (or have it checked by a qualified person).

I am looking forward to receiving a new version of your paper. I may submit it to one or two of the referees.