Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Point 1: The authors, hence, and for a better presentation of their achievements, should show their algorithm performance on images with rather more complicated noise, more natural type, not only salt and pepper or Gaussian noise. I suggest they should consider medical or rather biological images and check the results of applying other filters (Canny filter, for example) in addition to those mentioned and studied by the authors. I think this way they can enhance the methodology with something new and show how exactly their method outperforms the known ones.

Response 1: In order to better demonstrate the performance of the algorithm, we added the Canny algorithm as a comparison algorithm to the comparison experiment, and then added Poisson noise and guided filtering as anti noise performance test experiments. In addition, we also added a biomedical cell image sets to test the algorithm, as shown in Figure 6

Point 2: Moreover, the authors should consider more recent references for comparison. There is no reference from 2022 whilst the 2 or 3 ones from 2021 are not of great significance for comparison.

Response 2: The latest relevant literatures were consulted and cited as references. The relevant references are [31], [35], [36], [39], [40] in lines 281-283