

Thank you very much for the careful reworking of your paper. I read your revised submission and you will find a list of my notes below, which should be easy to implement and enhance the consistency of your paper. I hope you will find these minor technical suggestions useful.

My technical recommendations:

You sometimes use a space between the number and its unit and sometimes not. I would suggest making that consistent.

Line 91: gaps > 10s

Figure 1: Something seems to have gone wrong with the units in Figure 1. While e.g. the count is unitless, the gap length should have a unit (i.e. s) as well as the cumulative axis, i.e. %.

Figure 6: You use [sec] as the unit, but used [s] in your other figures. I would suggest to consistently use [s].

Line 255: is used since.

Line 256: I think it should mean: .compared to the squared exponential.

Line 265: This section's

Table 2: In the header, please correct `` to s. Also, please clarify what the last row of the table is (I assume it is the average).

Line 282: It's not clear which table is meant with `latter table`

Line 291: The units are missing for the values of sigma.

Line 305: Spell `geometric` with a small letter.

Figure 8: Unit Km may better be spelled km, as this is the SI unit. Also, is f given in % as in Figure 7, or is it actually a fraction? A fraction of 0.13 would be 13%, which is quite different to 0.13% if you would have forgotten the unit of f. Please be consistent if you use the same name. Please also clarify that for Figure 9.

Line 339: As far as the gap size increases.

Line 341: The sentence starting in this line is not quite clear to me. Have you introduced what 3σ means? It is also not quite clear to me how you see that the bootstrap approach provides a sensible uncertainty estimate. It's of course a lot better than the other estimation, but as you mentioned the uncertainty in this case is very hard to estimate.

Line 364: (ECVs)