We wish to thank the reviewer for the positive evaluation of useful comments on our manuscript. We provide a point-by-point response below.

- The accuracy (proportion of correct classifications) was 94 % (κ = 0.83). Based on the parentheses, one could read that the proportion of correct classifications was 0.83, although it is probably meant that accuracy is just a synonym for the proportion of correct classifications. Please revise the sentence to avoid this risk of misunderstanding.

  We will revise this sentence to clarify.

- sensitivity to this threshold?

  Indeed, it is probably better to write “to this threshold” instead of “of this threshold”

- at least one external data set / at least one of the external data sets?

  We will rephrase “at least one of the external dataset”

- A reference to the definition of kappa would be useful.

  We could have cited the paper by Cohen (1960) but we already had the maximum number of references allowed for a brief communication (20). We assumed that the kappa is now well known in the scientific community and its definition can be easily found in many textbooks or wikipedia.


- L88, L106. “Results” should be Section 3 and “Conclusions” Section 4.
We thank the reviewer for noticing this mistake.

- Check the alphabetical order in the list of references.

We have checked and did not notice sorting error (the list was generated automatically with a citation management software)

- L207-208 (Caption of Fig. 2). Please specify the value of HS_0 used for the right-hand-side matrices.

We will add the information.