

Editor summary:

We have received one re-review from Reviewer 1, and the second reviewer declined to re-review, but was mostly positive about the manuscript in their earlier review. Reviewer 1 finds that most of their comments have been well addressed and suggests a minor technical correction. In their earlier review, Reviewer 2 made a number of suggestions, including clarification of the methodology. I find the proposed changes in the revised manuscript address these comments well; the terminology is more consistent and the model approach is easier to understand than before. Therefore, on the basis of these two reviews and my own reading of the revised manuscript, I am happy to recommend publication of this interesting work.

*Author response: Thank you reviewing our corrections to Reviewer 2's comments and for handling our manuscript fairly and efficiently.*

Residual reviewer comment:

It is my second time handling this paper. I was reviewer #1 the previous time. I have checked the authors' responses to all comments raised by both reviewers and they are mostly satisfying. I recommend accepting the paper after authors perform a technical correction. They should clarify their explanation of the Gini impurity (lines 180-187). The way equation (1) is presented in the revision, the Gini impurity reads like a static number and it is not clear to readers how a feature changes it. I would recommend for authors to either add details to explain how the Gini impurity score is used in practice to compute feature importance, or to drop the equation.

*Author response: Thank you for this final amendment. We have dropped the equation as suggested. We have also shortened and tidied up the description of the feature importance computation to provide the required high-level information on this approach. Gini impurity is used widely in classification and references are provided for readers that wish to replicate our classification analysis.*