**Response to Reviewers**

***Review Comments to the Author***  
Please use the space provided to explain your answers to the questions above. You may also include additional comments for the author, including concerns about dual publication, research ethics, or publication ethics. (Please upload your review as an attachment if it exceeds 20,000 characters)  
  
Reviewer #1: After the corrections made, the article can be published.  
  
Reviewer #2: (No Response)  
  
Reviewer #4: The authors have addressed some of the reviewers' comments, and improved the experiments to some extent. For example, authors have added comparisons of Renset18/34/152 and DenseNet for whale/water classification.  
However, there are still major concerns in the experimental part:

1. They way authors chose Learning rate = 0.0009 in Table 1 seems ad-hoc.

**Reply:** #### Adding yet more LR tests to show this

### Began with Resnet18, and examined different learning rates. Once we settled, we tested a more limited set on the other models.

2. In Table 3. how do authors explain that Renset18 is better than Resnet34/152 given the latters are proven to be better in image classification?

**Reply:**

3. In Table 2, what happened to the 10th fold, the recall is abnormally small. Seems like the same problem happened to the first fold as well.

**Reply:**

4. Again, the authors claim that this is the first work to apply CNN to classify cetaceans from satellite imagery. Then how do we compare the results to previous researches? A traditional method must be present. E.g., given the fact that Resnet18 is better than deeper and wider networks, will simpler classifiers like SVM classifiers work even better in this case, I wish to see the results.  
  
In summary, I appreciate the efforts of this work, but I hope the experimental setup can be organized better.

**Reply:**