Again, I thank the authors for addressing my comments. I have to admit I am disappointed that, despite asking twice, the authors refused to perform any new experiments, even though this should only take a few hours. I still believe that adding more network experiments would have made the paper much more interesting. I still have one complaint about the CNN experiments and their interpretation (see below). However, the paper probably has just enough merit to be published as is. I leave it to the authors to decide what to do with my final comments.

CNN Experiments: I only just realized 2D convolutions were used. I guess I just assumed that the convolutions are 1D. This choice is odd. From my point of view (and that of others I believe) the more natural choice would have been to use 1D convolutions and treat the different variables as channels. Again, a comparison of these two would have been really interesting, but I assume that the authors aren't willing to perform new experiments… In any case, one of the key conclusions of the paper (it's in the abstract) is that CNNs are more accurate but slow. But what I think makes the CNN models slow is the huge Dense layer, I would assume. Performing a fully-convolutional experiment would have shed light on this. In the absence of these clarifying experiments I would suggest being more careful with the wording because, from my point of view, the experiments do not support the current claim.