Report from Associate editor (6/8/2026):

“Two reviewers have provided constructive comments to the manuscript, to which the authors have responded in detail. I went through the documents and suggest the following:
- Given that both reviewers highlight concerns about the FFNN method (reviewer 1 is concerned about its applicability in this region and reviewer 2 requests more details to understand the method), I believe it is warranted that this information is partly included in the manuscript. The basics of the method should be understandable to the readers of this manuscript without having to read Chau et al (2024), and the authors could for example include Table R1 and/or Figure R3 as an appendix to the manuscript.
- Both reviewers request a restructuring of the method section and specifically mention section 2.4 as an example. I agree with reviewer 2 that most of section 2.4 better fits in the results and suggest that the authors in general take the comments on restructuring the method section into account.
After receiving the new version, the manuscript will be sent out for another round of revisions”

Author Reply:

We thank the editor for the positive review and suggestions.

In the revision more details have been included for the FFNN model. We have added Table R1 and Figure R3. Therefore, figures numbers have been revised accordingly.
The Section “results” has been restructured (and section number changed)..
We also added few references suggested by reviewers.

Best regards,

Nicolas Metzl