

Response letter on the Paper
Robust functional linear regression models (RJournal 2022-95)

January 21, 2023

Responses to the comments of Reviewers

We appreciate the Reviewer for the insightful comments and suggestions. We believe the revised manuscript is able to address the identified issues. In this response letter, the reviewer's comments are in plain text, while our responses are indented.

We have addressed the comments point-by-point, as laid out below.

Reviewer 2

Major comments

1. Contrary to opinion from one of the reviewers it is not necessary to include detailed code listing in the paper for producing all of the plots. Instead in the paper refer to the relevant section of the supplementary code file.

Thank you for your suggestions. In the revised manuscript, we presented the code of only one of the plots for a specific example. As suggested, we referred to the supplement code file for complete reproducible code.

2. Captions are not appropriately constructed: should have three components: (1) what is the plot/table about, (2) specific details of plot/table, like what type of display and how variables are mapped, (3) the most important thing that the reader should learn.

Thank you for your suggestions. In the revised manuscript, we updated the captions of the plots to provide more detailed information about the plot.

3. If you use colours in a figure, consider colour choices and refer to what colour represents in the caption. I do not see the purpose of curve colours in Figures 1 and 2 for example.

Thank you for your suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we used only black color in the figures and the colored points/curves were used when necessary.

4. It is hard to see 5 curves in Figure 3. Which is which? No need to use line types.

Thank you for your suggestion. In the revised manuscript, we updated Figure 3 as suggested.

5. The code file has an error in lines 341 403.

Thank you for pointing out the error. The typo, which caused the error, has now been corrected.