Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

(1) The novelty of the study is not sound as elaborated in the manuscript

Response: Thanks for your suggestion.

For a single background, this paper can reduce the learning noise of neural network and improve the accuracy of neural network by modifying the number of channels. The adjustment of the neural network depth is for the speed of the overall network, because the deeper the network is, the better the fitting will be, but it will fall into the local optimum, unable to obtain a better solution. When the number of layers of the neural network reaches a certain number, increasing the number of layers cannot improve the recognition accuracy of the neural network. The overall accuracy is improved compared with the original network.

(2) The proposed model algorithms are not well elaborated in comparison with the existing ones

Response: Thanks for your suggestion.

The adjustment of the number of channels in this model makes the whole network learn less noise, which can improve the accuracy of the neural network model. Then replace the neural network depth and neck network to further improve the detection speed of the neural network. Compared with other networks, the detection accuracy and speed of this model are better than other networks.

(3) The methodology and experimental setup are not elaborated adequately

Response: Thanks for your suggestion.

Our experiment has carried out many comparative experiments on each step of its modification. Moreover, the experiment is compared with other models. However, the description of improvement is not perfect, and we will make it clear. For the deficiencies, we will improve the design of the experiment.

(4) The manuscript contexts require extensive editing. There are many unclear statements and improperly used symbols.

Response: Thanks for your suggestion. We will revise the overall problem.

(5) The attained results are adequately elaborated.

Response: Thank you for your comment. We will improve more fully.