The paper has an interesting topic. An acceptable numerical method has been used, which is useful in different industries and sections. However, the authors should address the following items to enrich the manuscript.

1. The literature review of the study is acceptable. However, it needs to be improved by explaining the most relevant studies to the topic. The authors have cited 23 studies within the first 2 paragraphs of the introduction, while the total references are 31. Thereby, as can be seen, most of the references have been used in bulk citation mode.
2. In the abstract, the authors claim the simulation without any approximation. However, in section 2, the authors consider incident field on each reflecting elements at a certain angle as a plane wave with a phase proportional to the distance from the phase center of the feeder to each element. Is this can not be considered a simplification?
3. In section 3, the authors have considered the separation between the elements ds to be 0.1 λ. How do the authors get this?
4. In the introduction, the authors must use the following papers that can be found on the Sensors MDPI Journal in order to enrich this section and improve the quality of the literature review.
5. Bandwidth enhancement and frequency scanning array antenna using novel UWB filter integration technique for OFDM UWB radar applications in wireless vital signs monitoring, Sensors 18 (9), 3155, 2018.
   Resonator based switching technique between ultra wide band (UWB) and single/dual continuously tunable-notch behaviors in UWB radar for wireless vital signs monitoring, Sensors 18 (10), 3330, 2018.
   A robust channel estimation scheme for 5G massive MIMO systems, Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing, 2019.
   Integrated LTE and millimeter-wave 5G MIMO antenna system for 4G/5G wireless terminals, Sensors 20 (14), 3926, 2020.
6. The quality of the Figures is very low. For example, in Figures 2b and c, the numbers can hardly be read. The authors should revise the figures with high-quality ones.
7. In Figure 3b, while it is expected the graph to be symmetrical, it can be seen that the phase degree in the x=-100 is almost -50. However, the phase degree is less than -50 for the x=100. What is the explanation of the authors for this?

8. In Figure 10, the dB amount has been increased in 50 degrees rather than 40. Considering the GA pattern, the dB amount might be less in 50 than 40, as we can see on the negative side. How do the authors explain this?
9. In section 7, It is suggested to put the direct output of the reflection cofficient of the fabricated Yagi–Uda antenna instead of adding the output with the device.
10. The conclusion of the paper must be revised and should be written in a proper way. In the last part of the conclusion, the authors have mentioned that Good agreements between the obtained results and the simulated results are obtained. Here is the conclusion, so the authors should mention the specific value/index instead of "good agreement."

All in all, the paper does not recommend for the publication, and it needs major revisions.