

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 1, Page 1:**

“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 2, Page 1:**

“The parameter α represents the learning rate, which is adaptive. (Reviewers 1.2a)”

↪ **Section 3, Page 1:**

“Future work will focus on adaptive learning rates (α) 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 2.1, Page 1:**

*“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 2.1, Page 1:**

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