

# Response to Reviewers

Project: Conference Simulation Homework

## Reviewer 1, Comment 1

**Comment:** *The abstract is too vague. Please clarify the contribution.*

**Response:** We have updated the abstract to explicitly state our contribution regarding the ensemble method.

### Revisions in Manuscript:

↪ **Section ??, Page ??:**

*“We have clarified the specific contribution of our hierarchical ensemble method in the abstract to address the ambiguity. (Reviewers 1.1)”*

## Reviewer 1, Comment 2

**Comment:** *You mention 'alpha' but never define it consistently. Fix this in Intro and Conclusion.*

**Response:** We have added the definition of alpha in the Methodology and updated the Conclusion to match.

### Revisions in Manuscript:

↪ **Section ??, Page ??:**

*“The parameter  $\alpha$  represents the learning rate, which is adaptive. (Reviewers 1.2a)”*

↪ **Section ??, Page ??:**

*“Future work will focus on adaptive learning rates ( $\alpha$ ) as discussed in the Methodology. (Reviewers 1.2b)”*

#### Reviewer 2, Comment 1

**Comment:** *How did you handle overfitting?*

**Response:** We used 5-fold cross-validation.

#### Revisions in Manuscript:

↪ **Section ??, Page ??:**

*“We utilized a 5-fold cross-validation strategy to determine the optimal sparsity threshold.  
(Reviewers 2.1, 3.1)”*

#### Reviewer 3, Comment 1

**Comment:** *Please specify the validation strategy.*

**Response:** As suggested, we clarified the cross-validation strategy.

#### Revisions in Manuscript:

↪ **Section ??, Page ??:**

*“We utilized a 5-fold cross-validation strategy to determine the optimal sparsity threshold.  
(Reviewers 2.1, 3.1)”*