Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

1. The manuscript needs improvement regarding the structure of the sentences, paragraphs and most importantly sections of the paper (e.g. Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results, Discussion). The authors do not fully follow the structure of the manuscript template as this is provided from the journal.

Response 1: In the new version of manuscript we took into consideration all your advises. The structure of sentences are corrected, text was reconstructed to follow the structure of the manuscript template provided from the journal.

2. The Introduction of this paper consists of only two paragraphs. The authors should discuss in more detail what has been done before by previous researchers. Please do not add a big number of references for only a single sentence in your paper (e.g. Lines: 40, 44). Instead please try to discuss the work of these researchers, which is relevant to your study. Also, in the Materials and Methods part, readers can only read equations and parameters; very few complete sentences are included.

Response 2: The absolutely new introduction section was included in new version of manuscript. The Material and methods section is reconstructed. However, we are convinced that math is the perfect way to describe the optimisation process exactly like it is. Please consider that the equations leaves no doubt, while descriptive language can leave misunderstandings and misinterpretations. Taking into account your suggestion, example of well aging compensation process was described and showed in Discussion part - Case Study subsection.

3. The paper is missing an important amount of references. Citations in the introduction referring to previous work are only superficially mentioned without any further information or relevance to the rest of the paper. The Introduction, Materials and Methods, Results and Discussion sections should be re-structured so that more information on previous research is available and gaps in knowledge are clearly described supporting the aim of this paper and proving its novelty.

Response 3: According to your suggestions the manuscript was completely transformed in this area. Introduction, Material and Methods, Results and Discussion was reconstructed. We hope that the development of the Introduction section will explain the state of the art, the knowledge gap and our motivation to try to solve the problem.

4. The authors should be more explanatory when starting a new section in their paper. The readers cannot be introduced to the problem discussed as the paper is presented at the moment. This is very important for the Introduction, Materials and Methods, and Results and Discussion
parts. These parts need significant improvement. However, the Abstract and Conclusions parts are well presented by the authors.

Response 4: We think that the reconstruction of the Introduction part to our manuscript will allow readers to understand the development of the issue in the following chapters. What’s more, the following chapters have been re-arranged, which could be useful.

5. Please try to form your Conclusions without the presence of equations and parameters. This way it will be easier to read. There is plenty of space at the Discussion part to explain in detail these parameters (where is the Discussion part in your paper?). Please include only your interesting and valuable conclusions in this part of your paper. Union the last three paragraphs of your conclusions as they are too short to be in the paper as separate paragraphs.

Response 5: The Discussion part was singled out in the new manuscript. It also include Case Study subsection. There is no equations in the Conclusion section, but in our opinion the parameters are necessary.

On behalf of myself and my colleagues I would like to thank you for your helpful review.