Reviewer 3

1. In-depth theoretical analysis or evaluation of the proposed method is not presented.

Response 1: This has been revised as per your suggestion. Please see p.4, lines 159-169, "The computational complexity... each packet once."

2. How the proposed method performs under different attack scenarios is not discussed.

Response 2: As suggested, a new section has been added. Please refer to p.4-5, lines 123-178, Section 2.

3. No comparison between the proposed method and some widely-known baselines in the field.

Response 3: We have compared our work with existing methods as suggested. Please refer to p.18, lines 466-472, "Next, we benchmark …during preprocessing," and p.19, Table 6.

4. The implementation details for reproducing the method is missing.

Response 4: This has been revised as per your suggestion. Please refer to p.5-6, lines 190-214, "Here are the details... address."

5. Comments on the Quality of English Language. Accessible but can be improved.

Response 5: We have sought assistance from a native English-speaking proofreader to revise the paper. We request that you review the entire document again.