Reviewer #1

5. Revision requirements

I enjoyed reading this paper. This is a well-written paper.

→ There is no response to this comment.

Reviewer #2

5. Revision requirements

Enhance the Abstract. It is really short. Add on methods, why this approach, results and concern.

→ We have extended the abstract with additional results and discussion.

Many scpaing problems -

e.g., "Lara et al.[7]". --> Lara et al. [7]

→ We solved the scpaing problem.

Use of comma: e.g.,

In this paper we construct --> In this paper, we construct

→ We have added commas.

Only 2/3 sentences for some sub-sections. Better to merge into another sub-sections. Too short paragraphs orsections are not good presentation style. There are many.

→ We have adjusted the style of the paper by merging some short sections and sub-sections.

"The model is trained on BCEWithLogitsLoss" - why? More explanations and reasonings will improve the paper.

→ We have added our reasons for adopting BCEWithLogitsLoss in section 3.3.

Average accuracy is extremely poor. Why?

No discussion on the results and reasons of failures. Just presenting the results are not sufficient.

→ We have added a discussion of the reasons for the low average accuracy in section 4.

The conclusions is too tiny to.

→ We have added the conclusions.