Thank you to all reviewers for their time and comments. The following responses will address the comments of notable weaknesses mentioned.

Comment: I think it is better for them to compare the results from different classification methods or dimensional reduction methods.

Comment: The author could have compared the performance of Random Forest to that of other less computationally intensive classifiers, such as SVM.

Comment: The results should be further explored with other classifiers (combinations).

Comment: They should try other traditional machine learning method and compare the performance.

**Response:** The author agrees with these comments as acknowledged in the Future Work section of the poster, “It will be interesting to apply this methodology to visualize and compare classification results and decision boundary of other models such as neural networks, SVMs, and linear models.”

Comment: Random Forrest classification without PCA trained could be compared.

**Response:** The author believes this is a misunderstanding. Random forest classification trained on the original data set was compared.

Comment: Mathematical description of PCA and Random forest is not presented.

**Response:** The author agrees that including a mathematical description of the techniques is beneficial. However, it was purposely not presented given the constraints of the poster size and would be included if the presentation format was a paper.

Comment: Parallel analysis could have been performed to find out how many principal components are required to capture most of the variations of the data.

**Response:** The author chose to use reduce the features to 2D so the decision boundary of the classification can be visualized. Performing parallel analysis to find out how many principal components are required would be a good addition to this work.

**Comment:** Maybe it’s more convincing to add the time expense and make some interpretation at biological angle on features with high coefficients in PCA.

**Response:** The author agrees with this comment as noted in the Future Work section of the poster, “further discussion is needed to consider the biological significance of certain features.”

Comment: Add more scientific evaluation metric to compare the two methods such as AUC in binary classification rather than only using accuracy and RMSE, since if the data exists unbalanced, the accuracy tends to be higher but the overall performance is still not good. It’s better to show the data distribution with regard to the labels.

Comment: They can draw ROC curve to analyse the robustness of the model.

**Response:** The author agrees that additional techniques can always be applied to validate the model, such can be said for all machine learning projects.