Cher Arthur,

Two referees have now sent their evaluations of the revised version of your paper. They are the same as the referees of the previous version. Although both had asked only for minor revisions, and not for a new review, I wanted to know whether they were satisfied with the new version. Both have now recommended acceptance of the paper (I put below the comments of referee 2, to which I think you have no access).

As editor, I however consider further clarification is desirable before the paper can be published. In the line of a comment that was made by Referee 1 on the previous version of the paper (his/her major comment 2), it might be useful to stress more strongly that you are dealing with (positive) physical fields, and not probability distributions. For instance, you might state explicitly in the comments following eq. (4) that the 'mass functions' considered in the paper are physical fields. And I suggest you avoid the word 'gaussian' (which will be automatically associated with probability distributions in the minds of some readers), for instance in section 4 (*Numerical illustrations*). You may speak of *squared exponential,* with the word 'gaussian' in parentheses.

And two additional remarks.

- Both notations $\mathcal{L}^2$ and L^2 seem to be used indifferently (see, *e.g.*, ll. 22 and 27, p. 4). Use consistent notations.

- Caption of Fig. 3, l. 3, *outputs of the model* → *fields at final time*

I look forward to receiving the final version of your paper.

PS. Comments of referee 2

I have read: (i) the authors' response entirely (ii) the introduction and the conclusion (iii) a selection of paragraphs (iv) the new experiment section.

I am very satisfied with the authors' response and how they handled the most important points raised by both reviewers.

Moreover, from the extracts that I have read in the manuscript, the English has considerably improved.

Best regards,
XXXX

Two minor typos in the introduction that you may pass on to the authors:
Page 3, line 11: Bonneel et al. (2011) should use called by a \citep.
Page 3, line 26: "lays" should be "lies"