Response to Reviewer Comments

We thank the reviewer for their time and care taken to review our manuscript. We have addressed all the comments and made changes accordingly. Of the two PDFs attached, DNN_Likelihood_Highlighted.pdf contains highlights of the changes we made, while DNN_Likelihood.pdf is the revised manuscript without the highlights. We are happy to address additional comments if they come up. Below are specific responses to the comments:

Abstract "... parameters–such as predictions coming from an effective field theory (EFT) framework–and ..." You should add spaces around the hyphens
- We thank the reviewer for pointing out this oversight. We have since examined grammar rules and conventions, and to keep it consistent with the rest of the paper, we chose to replace these hyphens with em dashes with no spaces around them. This change is highlighted in red.

p2 Typo "hyparameters"
- This typo is fixed in the new draft and highlighted in red.

p4 "axes---new" again spaces missing, also hyphen is very long
- Continuing the first comment, we found that it's more common to use em dashes for these occasions (instead of en dashes or hyphens), so we chose to keep it as is.

p8 Typo "disadvantaegs"
- This typo is fixed in the new draft and highlighted in red.

Ref. 3 is oddly formatted, the link exceeds the text width, and it is broken (due to the lin ebreak). Please try to fix this.
- We tweaked the formatting and the link no longer exceeds the text width. The link also works normally now. Please let us know if there are other oddities of the formatting of this reference.

Links in Refs. 4 and 5 are also broken
- The links are fixed in the new draft.

In addition, we changed "1-D" and "2-D" in the abstract to "1D" and "2D" to stay consistent with the rest of the paper. This change is highlighted in red as well.