

1 We want to thank reviewers for insightful comments, and we will improve the paper accordingly. In the following, we
2 focus on technical questions.

3 **Reviewer 1**

4 **Q1:** “One missing detail in the results is to report average performance with standard deviation to show the significance
5 of this improvement, especially that some results are close to each other.”

6 **A1:** We will add the standard deviation and error bars.

7 Thanks for your appreciation on this work.

8 **Reviewer 3**

9 **Q1:** “There are a lot of notations in this paper, it will be easier to read and follow if there is a single table to explain the
10 meaning of those notations”

11 **A1:** We will add a table to summarize and explain all notations.

12

13 **Q2:** “Will you plan to publish the code of experiments?”

14 **A2:** We will publish the code after the acceptance of this work.

15 Thanks for your appreciation on this work.

16 **Reviewer 4**

17 **Q1:** “The experiments ... It seems to be mostly on UCI datasets”

18 **A1:** MNIST is not UCI data. We use these datasets simply because they have been popularly used as baselines for
19 forest approaches [3,5,31]. We will add some non-UCI datasets, e.g.,

| Dataset | #Instance | MLP | RF | XGBoost | gcForest | MDDF |
|----------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| <i>ijcnn1</i> | 141,691 | 98.391±0.056 | 98.567±0.028 | 99.133±0.024 | 99.404±0.026● | 99.427±0.041 |
| <i>webspam</i> | 350,000 | 98.997±0.039 | 98.795±0.021 | 99.105±0.017 | 99.274±0.033● | 99.289±0.038 |
| | | | | | | |