This response document pertains to the paper *Auroral Classification Ergonomics and the Implications for Machine Learning*. The authors would like to thank the reviewers and editor for taking the time to re-review the work. Below is the response to the requests made.

— *D. McKay & A. Kvammen, 06-Jun-2020*

Response to Editor

Editor request: "*Based on the reviewers' comments, the article was considerably improved and is now acceptable for publication. I agree with one reviewer that the title should be edited to: "Technical Note: Auroral Classification Ergonomics and the Implications for Machine Learning".*"

We agree to the requested change.

Response to Reviewer 1

Reviewer comment: "*For final publication, the manuscript should be accepted as is.*"

No response required.

Response to Reviewer 2

Reviewer comment: "*many details are included and the paper have certainly improved from the first version. However, I have still some doubts about it, since my main comment is not properly assessed: it is not clear to what extent the paper is presenting some new findings supported by quantitative information. The manuscript is still dominated by the presentation of a checklist of biases for auroral classification and some strategies for mitigation of their effects but it does not provide much quantitative results. Therefore, it is difficult to evaluate the scientific soundness of the work. I agree that this contribution should have practical value for auroral research but can be not considered totally a novelty because have been suggested in previous psychology and cognition studies. Thus, at the current form, I would suggest to present this work as "Technical note" rather than as "Research paper".*"

We acknowledge the suggestion made to present the paper as a Technical Note. The title has been changed accordingly to reflect this, in accordance with the Editor's request, above.