Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your letter and for the comments by the reviewers. These comments are very valuable and helpful for our paper. We appreciate the careful, constructive, and generally favorable reviews given to our paper by the reviewers.

We believe we have adequately addressed all the excellent advices and questions raised by reviewers. Furthermore, we checked the manuscript and made sure the submitted manuscript is correct.

Please contact us if any further questions remain.

Sincerely yours,

Prof. Yu Pang
Response to the comments of reviewers:

Reviewer 1:

Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Q: The paper proposes Fusion High Resolution Network in diagnosing chest X-ray images, which performs well compared to existing CNN methods. In general, the manuscript gives a good description of the proposed methodology and results and conclusions are supported by the empirical data analyzed in the study. However, I believe the manuscript needs to be revised. The quality of the collected data is very good but I think the analysis presented in the manuscript is somehow limited and needs to be extended. The introduction part should be improved so that the relation to "electronic" is highlighted.

Ans: Thanks for the reviewer's suggests. We have checked the full manuscript repeatedly and made improvement in the main body of the paper, especially in Result and Discussion section. For the results in Table 1, we detail the contents and significance of Table 1, highlight the average AUC and the increase rate of Mass. From Table 1, the horizontal and vertical comparison shows that our method achieves superior classification performance. Correspondingly, the theoretical content and experimental analysis will be extended. In Introduction part, we cite more references and elaborate our work’s relation to the "electronic".

Each comment has been addressed carefully in our revised manuscript and the modifications are highlighted in red.