Dear Prof. Daniel da Costa,

Thank you very much for your time. We believe that our manuscript has now improved by addressing to the comments from the reviewers. We have amended the manuscript accordingly; please see the following response.

Replies to Reviewer 1

Comment 1：

The paper title in Page 1 is not the same as that in Page 2. Please correct!

Response 1：

This is our mistake, and we have made corrections. Thanks a lot.

Comment 2：

Please give full names for CQ and PS in Abstract, and for SMS in the first paragraph of Section 3.3.

Response 2：

We have added the full names for CQ, PS, and SMS.

Comment 3：

In Section 2, the authors said “We can divide this problem into three categories”. But, what are the three categories?

Response 3：

This is our mistake, and we have deleted this sentence.

Comment 4：

The label of Equation (1) is problematic.

Response 4：

This is our mistake, and we have made corrections.

Comment 5：

The authors claimed that the proposed schemes are performed in distributed manners. Please discus more about this.

Response 5：

Very good questions. In fact, only the CQ mode is performed in distributed manners. Users can independently make decisions without the need for communication. The PS mode is a centralized approach, a server to handle all the work.

Comment 6：

What does the notation “X’n” in Equation (5) mean?

Response 6：

This is our mistake, and we have made corrections.

Comment 7：

It is unclear how to group the users with different priorities in Algorithm 1.

Response 7：

We divide users into several groups by priority, and users of the same priority belong to the same group.

Comment 8：

There are no performance comparisons between this work and existing related works.

Response 8：

Very good comment and we have added performance comparisons between this work and existing related works in our paper.

Replies to Reviewer 2

Comment 1：

The proposed algorithms should be compared with the existing algorithm.

Response 1：

Very good comment and we have added comparisons between our algorithms with the existing algorithm in our paper.

Comment 2：

There are some grammar mistakes in the manuscript, polish the English further please.

Response 2：

We have corrected the grammar mistakes carefully. Thanks a lot.

Replies to Editor's Comments:

We have asked a professional English editing services center to check our manuscript. We have attached a separate English editing file to the revised manuscript.

Thank you again for handling our manuscript. Please do let us know if further concerns are raised, so that we can make improvement correspondingly.

Regards,

Bingxian Lu