

General comments

The new additions to the paper have strengthened the value of the results and made them more useful in general, allowing for some additional conclusions to be drawn that might previously have been only implied or guessed. Especially the comparison with a mass-only cost function gives the reader a good idea about when the additional complexity of the proposed approach is needed. With a few minor additions, this work will be ready for publication.

Specific comments

Section 3.3.1, page 10, lines 10-12: The newly added explanation of the size of the reduced load set would be even more clear if the expected uncertainty was quantified. I.e. how many % is the expected error in the computed fatigue damage?

Section 5.4, page 18, Figure 4: To more clearly show the impact of each variable on the total cost (objective function), you should add data in each plot for the variation of the total cost, ΔC_{total} .

Technical corrections

- Abstract, page 1, line 6: The suggestion for a change to this sentence was probably phrased badly in the previous review. For clarity, change "... a sum of terms." to "... a sum of various terms related to the cost of the structure."
- Section 3.2, page 8, line 21: "... a measure related to the actual costs." Change to "... a measure of the actual costs."
- Section 3.2, page 9, line 2: "The factor mass ..." Change to "The mass-dependence ..."