

We thank the reviewer for the useful comments. In the following, we answer the specific comments (included in “**boldface**” for clarity) and, whenever required, we describe the related changes implemented in the revised manuscript. Page and line numbers indicated refer to the original version of the paper published on AMTD.

## **Anonymous Referee #1**

### **Review**

**This paper is a continuation of the series of papers authored by Ceccherini et al. over the last few years. It continues the good work describing the features of the complete data fusion (CDF) method. As such, it is worthy of publication, provided the authors address the following general and specific comments.**

**The main general comment is the suggestion that the authors transfer even more of the technical discussions (e.g., in Sect. 3), including representation of equations, to an appendix (I have not checked all the mathematical workings, but they seem correct to me). Whether this should take place is a decision between the authors and the editor.**

We have already moved the lengthy calculation of the cost function variance in an Appendix, now we have difficulty in moving the remaining mathematics because it is an important part of the paper and involves definitions that we believe the reader prefers to find in the main text. Nevertheless, we are open to suggestions by the editor.

**Generally, the authors have done a good job of writing the paper. I have a minor correction:**

**P. 10**

**L. 2: probably -> likely.**

In the revised version of the paper we made the correction suggested by the reviewer.