We deeply appreciate your review. Overfitting is an interesting problem, which we have addressed to some extent in our experiments. Using the Trop-AMF experiment results as a case in point (Tab 3 is conveniently attached for reference), we can see from Experiment No. 2a that the network trained on training dataset A (derived from a real distribution with a limited data range) performs poorly on test dataset b (random distribution with a broader data range), as you pointed out overfitting. However, when we trained the network with training dataset B (random distribution, wide range of data), the network performed well on both test datasets a and b. (cf. Experiments No. 1a and 1b). We plan to improve the manuscript not to be misleading.

Therefore, we recommend training the network a large range and a large amount of random data to, allowing the network to cover the any possible data in order to eliminate uncertainty in unseen scenarios. We would improve our manuscript according to your comments.

Table 3. Summary of AMF predictions using Trop-AMF-Net and the LUT for the two test datasets. The test dataset a is based on the distribution A, which reflects the actual observed pattern. The test dataset b is based on distribution B, which is a uniform distribution. The Trop-AMF-Net model was trained using three different datasets A, B, and C based on distributions A and B and the LUT, respectively.

No.	Test dataset	Method	Training datset	RMSE	RMSPE [%]	R^2
1a	a (observation)	Trop-AMF-Net	A (observation)	0.003	0.121	0.99992
1b			B (uniform)	0.004	0.156	0.99987
1c			C (LUT)	0.027	1.277	0.99260
1d		LUT	-	0.046	2.302	0.97825
2a	b (uniform)	Trop-AMF-Net	A (observation)	0.425	16.965	0.37691
2b			B (uniform)	0.004	0.144	0.99995
2c			C (LUT)	0.013	0.617	0.99941
2d		LUT	-	0.022	0.949	0.99840