The authors have responded well to my comments and, in particular, have successfully shown the clock-angle effect in the DMSP data. I can recommend that the paper be published after some changes in the text to more accurately reflect the lack of agreement between the model and the data. As I said in my previous report "The paper shows histograms of the error of the predicted OCB compared to the observations for each of four storms, and it is readily seen that the histograms and standard deviation are roughly what would be expected for a uniform distribution of error over the range +/-5 degrees in latitude. This indicates to me that the model is essentially giving a random location for the OCB over a 10 degree range of latitudes, a range that is larger than the typical width of the auroral oval."

It is thus not accurate to say statements such as the statement in the Abstract "However, we generally find good agreement between the model and the observations.", and the statement at the end of the paper "the comparison between DMSP and OpenGGCM OCB locations show that the model predicts the OCB well". Please emphasize that the model does not do a good job of predicting the OCB at any particular time and location, but can reproduce the general trend as a function IMF Bz and clock angle.