Response to Reviewers

The following changes have been made to the paper in response to requested reviews:

* Wording was adjusted throughout the paper to emphasize that *local* models are good for producing predictions that are strictly a function of a **subset** of a large amount of data. Responses suggested that this was interpreted as “models make predictions from small amounts of data,” however this is not the case. The models make predictions from large amounts of data, while only using a small amount of data as ‘supporting evidence’ for a prediction.
* “but does not comply with the proceeding format of ISTAS”  
    
  An attempt was made to fix this. However, the only known misalignment was a table caption placed below (instead of above) Table 1. This was fixed for the camera-ready copy.
* “major issue of this work is the parameters selected for model comparison”  
    
  The only “parameter” selected is supposed to be interpretability, wording surrounding this was emphasized. Alternatively, perhaps the reviewer meant “accuracy” is a bad metric for evaluating a model? If that is the case, accuracy is (to our knowledge) one of the most common metrics used to pick a predictive model a priori, so it seems as reasonable a choice as any for this work.
* “correlation between race and criminal incidences appears to cause major biased perception itself”  
    
  It is not entirely clear what is biased about this. Only facts are reported in the paper, we were careful to withhold all opinions from the matter in writing (if not, we can gladly adjust!). It is mentioned that readers *may* find the discrepancies between race and criminal predictive outcomes unethical, and many cited works deal with a similar issue. Biased treatment of individuals by race *appears* to be very prevalent in society and data.
* “The ethical analysis should identify causes which keep society informed or be improved. The authors should identify parameters not in the category of discrimination for analysis.”  
    
  Wording has been adjusted to make it clearer that the goal of the paper is to propose a framework for making ethical predictions. This is a case study, meaning it is not intended cover all possible ethical considerations. It has been further emphasized that the framework *can* allow for detailed ethical analysis of data because of interpretability.
* “Also, analysis with combined multi-parameters is suggested to avoid discrimination against one particular factor. How does violent environment affect people?”  
    
  If given a reference on the matter, we will gladly investigate. Assuming that this last question is an example of “multi-parameters”, then we can comment on the ability of this framework to answer such a question: the subset of data utilized in a local prediction offers the chance for statistical significance analyses related to changes in distributions of observed variables. If a variable related to violent environments was provided, it could be analyzed for any effects *at prediction time*. That is a strength of the *local* predictive framework.
* Various grammatical errors – These were individually addressed and another final pass was done on the paper in preparation.

We are very grateful for the thoughtful feedback and suggestions of the reviewers. The adjustments made in response appear to have meaningfully improved the quality of this work.