

# Answer for the Editor

We would like to express our sincere appreciation to the Editor and the reviewers for their thorough evaluation of our manuscript and for their constructive and insightful comments. We have carefully revised the paper to address all observations, and all corresponding changes have been highlighted in green. We are confident that these revisions have substantially improved the rigor and clarity of the work. The following document provides a detailed, point-by-point response to each comment raised by the Associate Editor and the reviewers.

## Issues reviewed

- Please consider removing Fig. 1, as it does not provide relevant information

**Reply:** We thank the reviewer for this observation. The figure has been removed from the revised manuscript as suggested.

- After an equation ending with a comma or semicolon, do not add indentation or capitalize the following sentence.

**Reply:** We thank the reviewer for this helpful observation. Although the specific location of the issue was not indicated, we conducted a careful review of all equations in the problem statement. In particular, we revised the explanatory sentences that follow the formulas, removing unintended indentation and correcting any improper capitalization to ensure full compliance with the formatting requirements. We trust that these targeted revisions adequately address the reviewer's concern.

- Maintain consistent grammatical person and number throughout the article; avoid alternating between first-person (we do...) and impersonal constructions (it has been done)

**Reply:** We appreciate this valuable suggestion. Maintaining a consistent grammatical person indeed improves the clarity and readability of the manuscript. Accordingly, we have revised the document to ensure that all sections are written in the first-person plural.

- Please, avoid referring to functions/variable names from your own code. Use clear identifiable names for these parameters (i.e. TABLE 2)

**Reply:** You are right. We have revised the column names in all tables to ensure they are clearer and no longer reference implementation-specific variable names.

- Multi-objective problem is not formally presented

**Reply:** Thank you for your comment. This suggestion is highly relevant and contributes significantly to improving the quality of the manuscript. We have therefore added the formal mathematical formulation of the multi-objective algorithm to the problem statement.

- In TABLE 5, the trailing digit in 232.20000000000002 is indicative of numerical cancellation or floating-point round-off error, please use two significant figures

**Reply:** Thank you for pointing this out. The value has been rounded to two decimal places as suggested.