Reviewers’ comments

1. PSF simulations were confusing: "The authors attempted to show the 3-D PSF. The results in Fig. 2 are confusing. What are the coordinates of the simulated point-target? Please explain the results, which don’t seem to represent the point-target’s responses. "
   1. Question: Do we need to keep the PSF simulations or perhaps we should just remove them since we don't have a lot of space to explain them well
      1. Action: removed the PSF images that demonstrate the finite aperture effect.
      2. Action: rewrote the PSF section to be more clear and explain the coordinates and scanning parameters
2. The simulation portion may be unnecessary/need to be rewritten: "The simulation section should be more clearly written. " | "Due to the page length limitations, the authors are probably not exploring a variety of targets or examining the computational complexity of their algorithms versus the SISO-SAR and MIMO-SAR. I would request the authors to skip the section on the simulation results and instead discuss the measurement results in greater detail."
   1. Question: Should I shorten the simulation portion? Or, just remove it completely and discuss the actual measurements in more detail, as requested by the reviewer?
      1. Action: rewrote the simulation portion to clarify and remove unnecessary wording.
3. Changes to Section IV (summary of algorithm): "Section 4 is not required. The algorithm can be summarised at the end of the previous section. It is not immediately obvious to the reader which steps of the algorithm are followed from previous works and which are the newly introduced steps. "
   1. I think I should add some discussion on the novelty of our system in this section
      1. Action: added some explanation of the novelty of the proposed algorithm and the system we implemented
   2. I also think combining this with the previous section is a good idea. Should I combine them?
      1. Action: combined with previous section