

Dear Zeng et al.,

Thank you very much for addressing my comments, feedback and concerns in such great detail. Thank you also for providing such detailed explanations in response to my questions.

It was a pleasure to read your revised manuscript. I found that the manuscript has greatly improved in clarity, structure and language. The terminology used is much more consistent and the definitions you provided for all terms make it much easier to understand the methodology and results. In my opinion, your efforts have assured that researchers from many different fields can understand and appreciate your work. I believe the revised manuscript has improved to such an extent that it is ready for publication.

Below you can find just some very minor comments. I refrained from providing detailed comments again because I believe the quality of the paper to be high enough for publication and do not wish to delay the process unnecessarily. Potentially, it would be good to read through the paper one last time in detail for spelling and grammar mistakes (although I did not encounter any when reading the paper).

I have some final very minor comments:

- *Table with definitions in the response letter (page 35)*: I was very happy to find a very clear table with an overview of terms and definitions in the context of the research. It helped me greatly to interpret the methodology, results and discussion of the paper. However, I did not find this table in the main paper (potentially this is by accident?). Could you please include the table you created in the main text.
- Thank you very much for explaining that the experiments mainly serve “proof-of-concept and exploratory purposes” in Section 2.3 of the methodology. This was unclear to me the first time I read the paper and made me read the paper in a very different way.
 - *Recommendation 1 – last paragraph introduction*: I would recommend to stress the purpose of the experiment (described in Sentence 3-6 of Section 2.3) in the last paragraph of the introduction. I notice you do use words like “explore”, which I now understand refers to what you describe in Section 2.3. However, it may be good for the reader to realize the full purpose a little bit earlier, so that they do not read the paper with too high expectations.
 - *Recommendation 2 – abstract*: I am wondering if you could slightly revise sentence 21 (“Illustrative numerical experiments...”) of the abstract to reflect on the purpose in the way you do in Section 2.3. I realize you have likely added the word “illustrative” to hint towards this. However, I am wondering if you could use the words “exploratory purposes” or “proof-of-concept” you use in Section 2.3 instead, as this fully clarified the purpose to me.
- *Robustness (Section 4.3)*: Thank you for defining robustness in detail and clarifying what you mean by this in the discussion of the paper. Would it be possible to reflect on robustness in the methodology as well (e.g., at the end of the methodology), so

that the reader knows a reflection on robustness is coming and what you mean by robustness?

- Sentence 772 (*"In such cases, a robust and..."*): Would it be possible to expand on what a well-designed error-handling mechanism could entail?