Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

Dear reviewer,

thank you very much for your time and efforts reviewing our manuscript. We believe your comment have indeed improved our work and we hope to have answered all open questions and corrected all errors. In the next paragraphs, we answer all comments individually, where the original comment is in black, while our answers are in red for better readability.

Regards,
Damien WOHWE SAMBO,
Blaise Omer YENKE,
Anna FÖRSTER,
Paul DAYANG.

**Point 1:** In the introduction, this paper describes well the previous works. However, the object and subject of this paper are a little bit ambiguous. I hope the authors should add a more detailed and explicit purpose of this paper.

**Response 1:** Thank you very much for pointing out this issue, we have adapted the Abstract and Introduction to better explain our scope and goals.

**Point 2:** If possible, the authors should mention about definite advantage and disadvantage for cited papers in previous works.

**Response 2:** Thank you for the proposition. It can be noticed that the choice of the ML-CI approaches is related to the application’s requirements. We therefore added comments and details for more explanation. See Section 4.

**Point 3:** A revision of English can improve the quality of the article.

**Response 3:** Done.