GE LOCAL COMMENTS

# Reviewer 1

## 1. Comment

The technique of simulated annealing is inadequately described, despite being quite critical to the paper's whole concept. A clear description of simulated annealing would be extremely helpful.

## Response

We have added a flowchart in order to demonstrate more precisely the steps of the used simulated annealing algorithm in subsection 2.2

## 2. Comment

There are many tables of numbers in the results section, and they can be difficult to interpret. Perhaps some comments on those numbers, pointing out what is notable and important, combined with shading or emphasis of specific areas of the tables, would help the reader to interpret them.

## Response

We have used bold notation for the datasets where the proposed method outperforms the original neural network construction technique. Also, we have added the following text in subsection 3.3:

“*In all cases the simple Neural Network Construction technique outperforms other machine learning techniques and this is evident from the average result (the last row in experimental tables). Although, the proposed method significantly reduces the classification error or the error in the data fitting sets in most of the cases where it was used. In fact, in order to show in which cases there was a reduction in the error, bold marking was used in the tables of results.* ”

## 3. Comment

Some of the graphs are also a bit hard to read. In particular, when the points are all clustered in one area as in Figure 4, it can be hard to read. The authors might consider whether a zoomed-in view of the denser part of the plot, or a log scale on the Y axis, could be a useful additional view for the reader.

## Response

**(ALEXANDROS)**

## 4. Comment

The authors might also consider whether some kind of graphical representations might help the readers to understand the problems and the solutions they are discussing. In many papers on optimization, example functions of two variables are shown as 3D surfaces, enabling readers to visualize issues such as local minima, the progress of algorithms as they approach optimality, and similar issues. As this is often done as I said, they may be able to find some existing figures for which they could obtain permission to include in the paper, as opposed to doing the work to make up their own.

## Response

The purpose of the current work is to extend the Grammatical Evolution procedure by adding a local search step. In order to test the efficiency of this proposal we add this step in Neural Network Construction in the current stage. Although, our feature work will include additions of this step in other Grammatical Evolution based techniques. Nevertheless, we have added a practical application of this work on a dataset related to alcohol consumption and the added text in subsection 3.3 now reads:

“*As a practical application of the suggested method, consider the dataset proposed in [*[*alcohol*](#LyXCite-alcohol)*], which relates the alcohol consumption and EEG recordings. The proposed method was applied on this dataset and it is compared against the original Neural Network Construction technique and the results are outlined in Figure* [*1*](#fig_alcohol)*.Once again, the present method outperforms the original artificial neural network construction technique and the performance appears to be stable as the critical parameter g grows.* “

## 5. Comment

Please ensure that all acronyms are defined at the time of first usage. As an example, the acronym BNF is used in the introduction without having been previously defined. There are also some spelling/typing errors, such as on the X axis of Figure 3, where a letter is omitted from the word "Classification". In addition, there are a few places where the grammar is slightly awkward.

## Response

Done.

The paper has been checked using the freely available tools of ispell and grammar check.

# Reviewer 2

## 1. Comment

In fact, this study belongs to a very classic research domain: neural architecture search. In this field, numerous studies have utilized metaheuristic algorithms to optimize parameters of neural networks. However, the literature review in this study is not comprehensive.

## Response

We have added the following paragraph at the end of Introduction:

“*In the same direction many researchers have published papers in neural network initialization or construction, such as the usage of decision trees to initialize the weights of a neural network[*[*nninit1*](#LyXCite-nninit1)*], initialization of the weights using Cauchy's inequality [*[*weight\_init2*](#LyXCite-weight_init2)*], application of discriminant learning [*[*weight\_init3*](#LyXCite-weight_init3)*]. Also, the issue of constructing the structure of artificial neural networks have been discussed in various papers, such as incorporation of genetic algorithms [*[*nngencon*](#LyXCite-nngencon)*], construction and prunning of the weights [*[*nnprunncon*](#LyXCite-nnprunncon)*], application of of cellular automata [*[*nncell*](#LyXCite-nncell)*] etc.* ”

## 2. Comment

The author has employed a hybrid of genetic algorithms and simulated annealing mechanisms, both of which are quite classical. The choice of these two algorithms needs further explanation. Additionally, the combination of algorithms is a well-established technique to overcome local optima issues. Therefore, the author needs to devote more space to elucidating the innovative aspects of this approach.

## Response

The following text has been added in the beginning of subsection 2.2, in order to clarify the selection of the Simulated Annealing method:

*“Simulated Annealing was chosen as a local search method, since it offers the possibility of representing the considered solutions in an integer form, which is critical for the Grammatical Evolution representation of chromosomes. In addition, this method has been distinguished for its easy adaptation to a multitude of problems but also for its ability to find the total minimum of functions through the point acceptance mechanism at high temperatures. In the present work, the Simulated Annealing will initiate from the current representation of a chromosome and gradually try to find other nearby representations that might lead to lower values of the fitness value.”*

## 3. Comment

Although there is an improvement in performance with the author's method, metaheuristic algorithms are known to be highly computationally intensive. Therefore, it is necessary for the author to provide an analysis of time complexity or a comparative account of actual computation times to ensure that the performance gains justify the computational costs.

## Response

We have added a time comparison between the original method and the three cases of the proposed method where the parameter g varies from 5 to 20. The added text in subsection 3.3 now reads:

“*In addition, in the graph of the figure* [*fig:Timecomparison*](#fig_Timecomparison)*, a comparison is made for the average execution time of each experiment for the classification datasets. The comparison was made between the initial method (denoted as NNC in the graph) as well as the various cases of the proposed technique by changing the parameter g to 5, 10 and 20. As expected, adding the local minimization technique to the Grammatical Evolution method significantly increases the execution time of the method, however this increase remains almost constant for different values of the critical parameter g . Moreover, by using parallel techniques that appear in the relevant literature this increase in execution time could be reduced.*”

## 4. Comment

The machine learning algorithms used by the author are too classic, which might reduce the credibility of the proposed technique's applicability to new neural networks. The author needs to offer more discussion on this aspect.

## Response

The following text has been added in subsection 3.3 to justify the selection of these methods:

“*The above techniques were used in the experiments as they are widespread in machine learning, such as the Adam method [*[*adam1*](#LyXCite-adam1)*,* [*adam2*](#LyXCite-adam2)*] and because they have a similar complexity to the present technique such as Genetic Algorithms.*”

# Reviewer 3

## 1. Comment

Since the authors propose a new optimization technique (i.e., an extension of the conventional Grammatical Evolution approach), the technique should also be tested on (a) benchmark optimization problems/test functions for optimization or (b) real-world optimization problems.

## Response

The purpose of the current work is to extend the Grammatical Evolution procedure by adding a local search step. In order to test the efficiency of this proposal we add this step in Neural Network Construction in the current stage. Although, our feature work will include additions of this step in other Grammatical Evolution based techniques. Nevertheless, we have added a practical application of this work on a dataset related to alcohol consumption and the added text in subsection 3.3 now reads:

“*As a practical application of the suggested method, consider the dataset proposed in [*[*alcohol*](#LyXCite-alcohol)*], which relates the alcohol consumption and EEG recordings. The proposed method was applied on this dataset and it is compared against the original Neural Network Construction technique and the results are outlined in Figure* [*1*](#fig_alcohol)*.Once again, the present method outperforms the original artificial neural network construction technique and the performance appears to be stable as the critical parameter g grows.* “

## 2. Comment

Please include comparative analysis on the execution time taken by the proposed approach versus the conventional approach.

## Response

We have added a time comparison between the original method and the three cases of the proposed method where the parameter g varies from 5 to 20. The added text in subsection 3.3 now reads:

“*In addition, in the graph of the figure* [*fig:Timecomparison*](#fig_Timecomparison)*, a comparison is made for the average execution time of each experiment for the classification datasets. The comparison was made between the initial method (denoted as NNC in the graph) as well as the various cases of the proposed technique by changing the parameter g to 5, 10 and 20. As expected, adding the local minimization technique to the Grammatical Evolution method significantly increases the execution time of the method, however this increase remains almost constant for different values of the critical parameter g . Moreover, by using parallel techniques that appear in the relevant literature this increase in execution time could be reduced.*”

## 3. Comment

Please include discussions on the potential for the proposed technique to be employed for multi-objective, multi-constraint, nonlinear, nonconvex  problems as well as problems with noisy/uncertain decision parameters.

## Response

The following text has been added at the conclusions section:

*“The present modification could be applied to other techniques that use Grammatical Evolution without significant differences and moreover it could also be used to optimize functions either without constraints or with constraints in similar techniques that have been proposed in recent years. However, as it was seen from the experimental results, the addition of the Simulated Annealing technique significantly increases the required execution time and it is necessary to use techniques that are not particularly demanding in time or to search for termination techniques of the proposed Simulated Annealing variant that take advantage of its particular characteristics. Also, a field of research could be the search for more effective techniques to reduce the critical temperature factor used in the Simulated Annealing. ”*

## 4. Comment

Please include justifications on the reason for using simulated annealing and not other evolutionary techniques - e.g. genetic algorithm, differential evolution, swarm-based optimizer,..., etc.

## Response

The following text has been added in the beginning of subsection 2.2, in order to clarify the selection of the Simulated Annealing method:

*“Simulated Annealing was chosen as a local search method, since it offers the possibility of representing the considered solutions in an integer form, which is critical for the Grammatical Evolution representation of chromosomes. In addition, this method has been distinguished for its easy adaptation to a multitude of problems but also for its ability to find the total minimum of functions through the point acceptance mechanism at high temperatures. In the present work, the Simulated Annealing will initiate from the current representation of a chromosome and gradually try to find other nearby representations that might lead to lower values of the fitness value.”*

## 5. Comment

Please include limitations of the proposed approach (i.e., trade-offs compared with conventional techniques).

## Response

The following text has been added at the conclusions section:

“*The present modification could be applied to other techniques that use Grammatical Evolution without significant differences and moreover it could also be used to optimize functions either without constraints or with constraints in similar techniques that have been proposed in recent years. However, as it was seen from the experimental results, the addition of the Simulated Annealing technique significantly increases the required execution time and it is necessary to use techniques that are not particularly demanding in time or to search for termination techniques of the proposed Simulated Annealing variant that take advantage of its particular characteristics. Also, a field of research could be the search for more effective techniques to reduce the critical temperature factor used in the Simulated Annealing.* ”

## 6. Comment

Please check and correct overall quality of English in the manuscript - e.g. correct 'In current work...' in the abstract.

## Response

The revised manuscript has been thoroughly checked using the freely available tools of Ispell and GrammarCheck.