

Editor Response Document

We thank the editor for their assessment of our work and their additional constructive comments for improving the manuscript quality. We have provided a point-by-point response below.

Line 4: it should be “develop a ... retrieval algorithm ...”.

We agree, and this has now been added on line 4.

Line 108: references format needs correction.

These references have now been corrected on line 108.

Line 135: please write the full name of RF as this is the first time it is used rather than in Line 203.

We have now shifted the definition of RF (random forest) to line 135 as requested.

Figure 4: I understand there is a standard deviation bar shown in (b), but it seems like it also appears in (a) since the authors state “1 standard deviation ... shown in the shaded regions”? If this is true, I don’t see the standard deviation bar or shaded region in (a) ... Or is it actually referring to (c) and (d) rather than (a) where there are multiple light red and blue lines not explained?

We thank the editor for their comment and agree that this should be described better in the figure caption. The shaded region we are referring to here is present in (a), it is just fairly subtle. The presence of the region is most notable at the start of JOYCE for instance, and we have highlighted this in the text to help guide the reader. We have also included additional text in the caption describing what the red and blue lines refer to in (c) and (d).