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Dear Editor,

We sincerely thank the Editor, Associate Editor, and Reviewers for their time, thoughtful feedback, and the opportunity to resubmit our manuscript. We have carefully addressed all comments and revised the manuscript accordingly.

We are submitting the following files:

(a) this point-by-point response to the reviewers’ comments,

(b) a revised manuscript with changes highlighted in yellow, and

(c) a clean version of the revised manuscript without highlights.

Best regards,

Emre Kilcioglu and Claude Oestges

**Reviewer 1 - Comment 1:** *In page 3, section 2, the authors choose the NVIDIA’s open-source Sionna ray-tracing tool, can authors add some description compared with other RT tools, like, Wireless insite, to specify the advantage and efficiency of the Sionna.*

**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 1 - Comment 2:** *The authors utilized two methods to determine the reflection behavior of the RIS, authors are suggested to provided some figures, like simulation result, to specify the features and differences of the two methods.*



**Author response:** asdasd**--Reviewer 1 - Comment 3:** *In practical scenario, real RIS prototype typical have initial response for each element. Besides, the RIS typical have limited phase resolution depending on RIS bits. How to add the RIS in RT simulation scenario via Sionna, and it may be different from RIS added into conventional Wireless insite software.*



**Author response:** asdasd**--Reviewer 1 - Comment 4:** *The optimized parameters are calculated based on simulated coverage map, which requires modeling for actual scenario and exhaustive simulation, which may lead to large computation cost and overhead, especially for scenarios with many scatterers. So did the method have adjustable resolution, and did it influence the algorithm accuracy?*



**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 1 - Comment 5:** *The authors are suggested to list key parameters (like frequency, transmit power, RIS grid size, power threshold, etc.) in a table. Also, based on simulation results, the authors are suggest to provide a general guideline for the RIS location, size, and beamforming method.*



**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 1 - Comment 6:** *Many RIS prototypes are designed to orthogonally polarized, which means the incident wave and reflected wave of the RIS are orthogonally polarized due to its design. Do you consider this issue, how to handle this issue in RT software?*



**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 1 - Comment 7:** *Do you consider the height of the RIS? The height of the Tx, RIS, and Rx may influence the coverage performance of RIS-aided systems due to difference of reflection paths.*



**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 1 - Comment 8:** *The authors are suggested to provide more take-home message in conclusion, such as the guideline for the RIS location, size, and beamforming method for the selected scenario based on the simulation results.*



**Author response:** asdasd**--Reviewer 2 - Comment 1:** *\*\*[Page 4, Eq (1)]\*\**



*The reflection coefficient model for a single tile (RIS element) assumes a fixed amplitude profile. However, the reviewer notes that this may not fully account for practical considerations. While passive RIS elements inherently lack active amplification, their amplitude response can still exhibit angular dependency due to variations in incident angles. To enhance model accuracy and better reflect the directive properties of RIS, the authors are encouraged to incorporate angular-dependent attenuation effects into the reflection coefficient design. This adjustment would strengthen the alignment with real-world RIS behavior.*

**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 2 - Comment 2:** *\*\*[Page 5, Sec III.A]\*\**



*The Gradient-Based Phase Profile design requires further clarification to improve readability. Specifically, the derivation of the incident phase gradient in Eq. (2) and its relationship to the final phase shift design are not explicitly detailed. The authors are advised to expand this section by explicitly connecting the phase gradient concept to the implemented phase shifts (e.g., through mathematical steps or a design framework). This would help readers better understand the methodology and its theoretical underpinnings.*

**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 2 - Comment 3:** *\*\*[Page 5, Eq (12)]\*\**



*The distance-based phase profile model assumes constructive interference occurs when total propagation distances are equal. However, this may oversimplify practical scenarios. Due to the periodic nature of phase shifts, constructive interference could occur even with unequal distances. Additionally, environmental interactions (e.g., multipath effects) may lead to longer effective propagation paths. The authors are encouraged to revisit this model to account for these factors, ensuring it captures both phase periodicity and environmental propagation effects.*

**Author response:** asdasd**Reviewer 2 - Comment 4:** *\*\*[Page 7, Algorithm 2]\*\**



*The algorithm employs an exhaustive search to determine the optimal RIS width. While effective for the presented simulations, this approach may face scalability challenges in scenarios with unpredictable or wide-ranging candidate values. The authors should discuss the computational complexity of this method and propose strategies to enhance scalability (e.g., heuristic optimizations or theoretical bounds to narrow the search space). Such additions would better motivate the algorithm’s practicality for real-world deployment.*

**Author response:** asdasd



**--Reviewer 2 - Comment 5:** *\*\*[Page 10, Figure 7]\*\**

*The relationship between RIS dimensions and performance could be more clearly presented. Since tile size is fixed, for a larger height, the same expansion in width can leads larger number of additional tiles thus a better performance can be well expected. The reviewer believes directly correlating the number of tiles (elements) to the performance metric would improve interpretability. Additionally, the unit of the performance metric currently uses dB, which is not a correct unit for power. Clarifying this would avoid potential confusion.*

**Author response:** asdasd



**--Reviewer 2 - Comment 6:** *\*\*[Page 10, Figures 8 & 9]\*\**

*The interpretation of these figures requires further elaboration. The impact of parameter N on performance is not explicitly discussed, making it challenging to understand the figure. The authors should provide a clearer explanation of the trends, including axis labels, annotations, or a brief discussion linking N to the observed results. This would significantly enhance the figures’ value to readers.*

**Author response:** asdasd

