Response to Editor

Thank you for addressing the reviewer comments. I believed the manuscript improved a lot.

The addition of tables 3&4 is very important, as it shows the added value of the proposed method compared to standard methods.

Response: Thank you for the positive comments.

However, this needs more explanation. The improvement is more than I would expect given that PSDs are typically smooth. To guide the discussion, it would be informative to include 1 or more figures showing the reconstructed PSD for different methods.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion. I have now made a new figure as Figure 9, which includes 10 scatter subplots, where each subplot represents each method. From the figure, we can see the difference in the estimated and the measured PSD (of all size bins) for different methods. Some univariate methods show very poor results and now they are shown in the scatter plots. Some relevant explanations are also include in Section 4.1.