

Paper ID: 20 - Addressing reviewer comments

We hope that our clarifications and changes solve any doubts the reviewer had, as well as, improve the paper. We thank the reviewers for their valuable comments.

Reviewer #1:

4. List and clearly justify the weaknesses of the paper (2-4 sentences or bullets).

- *The paper does not discuss the impact of clouds.*
- *The paper does not discuss sunglint on the water, a fairly common occurrence in high resolution satellite images.*

This is an ongoing project. We added a few lines in the Conclusions section addressing these cases.

- *It is not clearly stated what is shown in Figure 6. Are these the YOLOv7 results?*

We've changed the figure's caption and text to clarify it.

- *Table 1, bottom row, should have "Sliding window frames per second", not "Frames per second"*

We've made the change in Table 1.

5. Write any additional comments regarding the paper that may be useful for revision but should not be considered in the paper decision (e.g., typos, suggestions).

- *Table 1 has commas in some numbers, but decimal points in others - all should be decimals.*

Table has been updated.

- *The text does not include the reference citations.*

We've included the reference citations.

- *The paper could use more editing.*

We've changed the paper to improve readability.

Reviewer #2:

4. List and clearly justify the weaknesses of the paper (2-4 sentences or bullets).

1. *The authors claimed that the algorithm is 'highly efficient' and 'extremely fast'. However, the preliminary results in Table 1 show that the total time of the proposed algorithm (MCPN) is 118,6304 seconds (329 hours) and the frames per second are 7569 seconds (~2 hours). How is this "highly efficient" and 'extremely fast'?*

We apologize for the confusion. We meant 118.63 seconds and 75.69 frames per second. We've corrected the numbers in Table 1.

2. Satellite varies in spatial resolution and extent. It is unclear what types of satellite imagery the authors tested on. How to make sure the algorithm trained on specific image resolution/type is applicable/transferrable to other images?

DOTA dataset includes different satellite resolutions coming from different satellites. The target images used in our test set share the same resolution as some of the images included in DOTA.

3. It needs a better literature review. There are a lot of ship detection algorithms available on GitHub, but none of them were mentioned.

We've updated the citations section and properly referenced them within the paper.

Regarding other ship detectors, we selected YOLOv7 due to the speed performance authors reported in their paper. The camera-ready version mentions other ship detectors.

5. Write any additional comments regarding the paper that may be useful for revision but should not be considered in the paper decision (e.g., typos, suggestions).

Figure layout can be improved to better utilize the space. Many long sentences.

We've corrected some long sentences and changed the layout of Figure 1.