

Author's response

We sincerely thank the editor and referees for their valuable feedback and comments on our revised manuscript. We have made vital modifications in our manuscript during the review process, striving to incorporate all the main recommendations. We believe that the article was significantly improved thanks to the outcomes of the overall process. The main modifications we have made in response to the last reviewers' comments are described below.

Referee #2: Riedel, Lukas

Comments: *“The revision of the paper is a distinct improvement over the initial draft and more clearly communicates the focus, outcomes and uncertainties of the study. I recommend it for publication after minor technical corrections.”*

We sincerely thank you, Lukas, for your continued efforts in providing another revision. Your initial revision has significantly improved our paper's clarity and overall quality.

Anonymous Referee #3

Comments: *“(…) In my opinion, the main problem with the paper is that you have not followed the classic structure of scientific works that provides for a clear separation between the methodologies applied (or proposed), the results obtained, and the discussion of the results. The combination of methods and results did not allow me to fully appreciate the work you have done and its value. I would suggest that you expand the introductory part of Section 3, trying to clearly describe the methodology followed with the help of a figure that shows the various phases of your experiment (flowchart). Consequently, I would group sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 into a section where you report and clearly describe the results of your experiment. Finally, I would ask you to consider introducing a discussion section of the results obtained that allows the reader to fully understand the experiment performed and its validity. (…)”*

We agree with your suggestion regarding the structure of our paper. It was a difficult choice that brought some advantages allowing a more direct reading of the paper with a specific focus on the last part of the results. However, it also revealed some frustration

at the end of the methodological part. In an effort to address this point, we have incorporated a discussion topic that encompasses relevant points previously mentioned in Section 3, as well as the conclusion topic. Additionally, we have included a flowchart, following the ISO 5807:1985, within the introduction of Section 3 to provide a visual representation of the description of our methodology. These modifications aim to enhance the overall coherence and organization of our paper.

We have reviewed the highlighted corrections mentioned in the attached comment file. Furthermore, we have implemented many minor modifications throughout the text to reduce wordiness and prioritize the active voice.

In conclusion, all details related to these modifications are described in the new version of the attached paper.

Best regards.

July 5, 2023, Belo Horizonte, Brazil

Author: André Felipe Rocha da Silva

Author: Julian Cardoso Eleutério