Reviewer C:

1. Figure 1 should be replaced because the quality of the image is not good at all and even readable when you zoom.

Response: Changed as indicated in the revised version.

1. The "neural network" is very general to use. What kind and what specific NN you have used?  
   Response: Details are provided in the Methods section of the revised version.
2. Methods: If you have aL, you need aR (not ar)  
   Response: a\_r is changed to a\_R as indicated in the revised version.
3. Why did you select two PCA components for NN? How do you decide the number?  
   Response: We selected 7 to 11 PCA components, not 2. The number of PCA components was determined iteratively based on calculated evaluation metrics.
4. Please revise your table. It's not good-looking at all.

Response: The table has been reformatted and cleaned up in the revised version.

Reviewer F:

1. The paper should be proof-read before further submission. The current form has several editorial and grammatical errors.

Response: Done.

2. Given the employment of an 8 layer multi-layer perceptron (MLP), it is not clear how the authors could address overfitting and the model's complexity. Have you tried simpler models (with less hidden layers) and/or linear regression model?

Response: This is addressed in detail in the Methods section of the revised version. Regarding model complexity and the risk of overfitting, we implemented several measures to ensure the generalizability of our model. First, our network design incorporates dropout layers, an effective regularization technique to reduce overfitting. Concerning the consideration of simpler models, we indeed tested models with fewer hidden layers as well as linear regression models. However, these simplified models did not perform as well in capturing complex nonlinear relationships and maintaining high accuracy as our meticulously designed NN structure.