Response to Reviewer 2 Comments

Dear reviewer:

Thank you very much for your suggestions; they have helped me improve the quality of my paper. I have corrected the errors in my paper and followed your suggestions. These changes are shown in red font in the revised paper. In this letter, I have responded to your questions. Please let me know if I need to make additional changes to my paper.

Point 1: First of all, indicate somewhere in the paper what the post-processing treatments the specimens underwent after the SLM production.

Response 1: The projectile after SLM production is only subjected to simple surface smoothing and heat treatment, and the heat treatment process is described in the blue letter section on page 4 of the article. The following picture is the bullet diagram after SLM production.



Point 2: What is the built direction of the specimens, especially those for the notch and quasi-static tensile tests?

Response 2: The red arrows below indicate the direction of the SLM build.



Direction of sample construction

Point 3: Did the authors analyse if different built directions could influence the

mechanical properties?

Response 3: This article has not yet analyzed the impact of different construction directions on material properties, and will continue to be carried out in the follow-up work.

Point 4: What is the original dimension of the specimens before they are machined up to the right dimensions for the tests?

Response 4: The diameter of the SLM specimen before processing is slightly larger than the diameter after processing, machining allowance is about 1mm thick. The size of the projectile after forming is almost the same as the finished product, and the surface is only simply smoothed.

Point 5: Please, enlarge the pictures in Figures 2, 3, 11, 16, and 18.

Response 5: These five images have been enlarged to the appropriate size.

Point 6: There are plenty of missing lines in the sketch of Figure 9. Please correct them.

Response 6: Changed in the diagram.

Thank you again for taking the value time to review my paper.