1. The paper lacks benchmarking against alternative optimization methods regarding key metrics. Such benchmarking is critically important to understand the significance of the proposed results compared to existing decoupling structures.

----provide comparison table for each antenna

添加和其他天线的对比表（隔离度，带宽）

2. hence it is recommended that the authors shared their codes and data.

-----provide code and give reference

整理代码和数据

3. The introduction should have a better review of similar Defect Ground decoupling structures.

-----Add it

修改introduction

4. The motivation for using the tree structure is not clear. There are other reported Defected Ground structures that were reported in the literature. Why is the tree structure better?

----More degree of freedom, add it

更好地描述一下树形结构地自由度更高这件事。

5. The authors should show that the computational cost of using the machine learning model is more efficient than using other efficient optimization approaches such as, for example, adjoint sensitivity analysis.

-----Not efficient, but provide good results. Parameter sweeping is not possible.

6. To compare only the reference antenna response to the optimal response of the antenna does not give the reader a clear picture of the process. The authors should show the best response in the dataset used for training the GNAN. If all the structures used to train the GNAN are near optimal, then it is expected that the GNAN will generate in a fast way an optimal design. However, if the data used to train the GNAN is far from being optimal, more computational effort will be needed to reach the solution.

------This information should be provided

把训练集中性能最好的样本展示出来，然后和最终优化的结果进行比较。