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Dear Editors,

We are pleased to submit the second revision of the manuscript “Comparison of subset selection methods in linear regression in the context of health-related quality of life and substance abuse in Russia”.

We provide a point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments, which includes the description of all changes made to the manuscript.

Best regards,

Olga Morozova
(on behalf of the co-authors)

Reviewer Comments: Pengyuan Wang

This is the review for the revised manuscript "Comparison of subset selection methods in linear regression in the context of health-related quality of life and substance abuse in Russia".

The authors did a good job addressing my concerns. It added reports of algorithms running time, extended the scope of compared approaches, and was better organized.

Minor Essential Revisions:
It did not take my suggestion about utilizing multiple datasets though. It is fine, as far as the paper is positioned as a case study to show the importance of choosing proper model selection approaches, rather than drawing general conclusions about these approaches. I think this point should be clearly stated in the introduction or abstract so the readers are aware of the limitations.

Response: We have added a sentence that emphasizes the point made by the reviewer into the last paragraph of the Background section.

Reviewer Comments: Zhongyang Zhang

The revised version of the manuscript addresses all my concerns. I have no further comments.

Response: N/A.

Reviewer Comments: Benjamin Guedj

I have carefully read the revised version of the paper, and I am pleased to acknowledge that the authors have addressed all of my concerns. In particular, I find the discussion section much more convincing now, tackling the statistical and computational issues raised by the methods which is proposed. I had no further requests.
Based on my previous report, I feel that the paper now deserves to be published in its current form.

Response: N/A.
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