**Reviewer #1:**

Major Comments:

The authors have addressed my major comments from the prior review, I have no major comments, and I appreciate the enthusiasm that the preprint has received as evidence of the importance of the manuscript.

**Further efforts to clarify what the call to action is, perhaps with a table of suggestions, would still be welcome. Table S1 was described in the rebuttal and manuscript, but not in the legend, and I couldn't find it. The idea is good though, I encourage including it.**

Table S1 was uploaded as a separate document with its header per author submission guidelines.

Minor Comments:

The manuscript will still benefit from revision for clarity, grammar, and ease of reading. Below are just some examples of locations in which grammatical nuances and (interpreted) inconsistencies caused me to pause and reread.

**1. Line 43: reword**

Line 43 is reworded for the ease of reading.

**2. Line 131-132: Is SRN a typo, or is 53% close enough to 46.7% to "maintain the overall case and control distribution"? (I missed this on the last look through.)**

We used a stratified cross-validation scheme to ensure that we would maintain the SRN/normal distribution already present in the dataset.

**3. Line 186-187: reword**

We reworded this sentence for the ease of reading.

**4. Line: 290-292: awkward**

We reworded for the ease of reading.

**5. Figure 2 caption: exchange horizontal for vertical when describing dotted cutoff and box medians?**

Corrected the figure caption accordingly.

**6. Figure 4: legend, colors, and caption still don't match - i.e. green mentioned twice in caption (two different greens); red legend incorrect**

We removed the legend from the figure due to size constraints and instead correctly labeled the overlapping colors in the caption.