

Dear editor,

We thank you for your positive assessment of our revised manuscript and for your suggestions. We have made the requested changes, as detailed below.

On behalf of all the authors,

Patricio Yeste

- L266-267: Would you have a reference to support this statement?

We thank the editor for this comment. We agree that the original statement was too broad and that the wording “provides no advantage” could be interpreted as a general claim about the applicability of LSTM networks to tabular data. Our intention was instead to explain why an LSTM architecture was not considered appropriate for the specific structure of our input data.

LSTM networks were originally developed to learn long-range dependencies in sequential data through recurrent connections and an internal memory mechanism (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997). In our case, the input consists of a fixed-length vector of p parameter values, with no temporal or other intrinsic sequential ordering among the predictors. Consequently, there is no sequential structure in the input for the recurrent mechanism of an LSTM to exploit. We therefore formulate the problem as a conventional tabular regression task, for which tree-based methods such as GBDT and feed-forward neural networks are well-established.

We have revised the corresponding statement in the manuscript to clarify this distinction and have added the relevant reference.

Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long Short-Term Memory. *Neural Computation*, 9(8), 1735–1780. <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>

- L360 and caption of Fig. 2: add “correlation” after Kendall tau and Spearman rho.

We thank the editor for pointing this out. We have added “correlation” after Kendall’s tau and Spearman’s rho in the caption of Figure 2. For consistency, we have also made the corresponding change in the caption of Figure S2 in the Supplementary Material.

- L460-463: This sentence is a bit long and it would improve readability to split it.

We thank the editor for this suggestion. We have split the sentence into two sentences to improve readability, as suggested.