

Comments on revised version.

Authors made significant improvements of their manuscript. I am appreciated that the authors took into account my previous comments. The manuscript is more completed now and shows meaningful results.

The title of the manuscript is more appropriate. Also, the introduction and conclusion are well structured, and it is much easier to understand the main goal of this work and its results. Authors conclude that the NNEs can provide an important information on the link between intrinsic and apparent relationships that provide more qualitative information than quantitative. It was not obvious in previous version of the manuscript.

The additional table 1 is very useful, as well as the Appendix B.

The results on figure 7 are very important and interesting. I want to congratulate the authors on this idea. Also new interaction plots help to enhance the main results and give the article completeness.

Thank you for the explanation of why you choose the 25th, 50th and 75th percentiles in your work to test the effect of limitations.

Questions and comments:

In the Eq.9 what do authors mean by min_s and max_s? Is it -1 and 1? Please clarify.

It can be better to present the maps of differences on Fig. 1. For example, keep Figure 1a like it is and show the differences on Fig.1 b, c and d between true values and ML methods.

On Fig. 2, 4 and 5 it would be useful to add the corresponding colours on the grey areas around curves.

Fig. 8, 9 and 12 miss a colorbar.

I did not notice any mention of the Appendix C in the text.