# To Reviewer # 7:

---

We appreciate the constructive feedback from the reviewer. As suggested by the reviewer, we have extended the current work and clarified the contribution.

### To Comment # 1:

Concern: ***References to non-probabilistic methods or to imprecise probability.***

Response: Yes, we agree with the reviewer about the importance of non-probabilistic methods as the completeness of the probabilistic information is often difficult to achieve. We have added a discussion on non-probabilistic methods in the introduction section. And suggested references have been added to the revised manuscript.

### To Comment # 2:

Concern: ***Whether the incremental scientific progress is sufficient for a contribution in CACAIE must be clarified.***

Response: In our opinion this is not an incremental progress. We have explicitly pointed out the novelty of the proposed model framework in Section 3 and added some phrases in the discussion section to address this issue.

### To Comment # 3:

Concern: ***The one-sided probability-based approach should be expanded.***

Response: We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. It would have been interesting to explore this aspect. Additionally, we also fully agree with the reviewer that probabilistic modeling, i.e. integrating model uncertainties is important for decision making. Therefore, we added some discussion on the potential combination of Bayesian methods and deep learning to the manuscript.

### To Comment # 4:

Concern: ***Advantages and disadvantages in the application of the different uncertainty models for the presented problem are to be clearly worked out.***

Response: We thank the reviewer for asking this important question. To study the model performance regarding different uncertainty models, we have extended current work. Due to text limitation constraints, results have been summarized in an individual file (file name: summary.pdf).