Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corrections highlighted in the re-submitted files.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Yes	The revisions have been made based on reviewer's comments.
Are all the cited references relevant to the research?	Yes	The revisions have been made based on reviewer's comments.
Is the research design appropriate?	Yes	The revisions have been made based on reviewer's comments.
Are the methods adequately described?	Can be improved	The revisions have been made based on reviewer's comments.
Are the results clearly presented?	Yes	The revisions have been made based on reviewer's comments.
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Yes	The revisions have been made based on reviewer's comments.

3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors

Comments 1: 217 and Fig. 4 legend:"Closed operation" should be “closing operation”.

Response 1: Thank you very much for your correction. Based on your suggestions, we have corrected the error. You can find the modifications in Fig. 4 legend of the revised manuscript.

Comments 2: Multiple locations: "binomial" should be "quadratic". These are not the same thing. "Quadratic" is the correct term for a second-order polynomial.

Response 2: Thank you very much for your correction. Based on your suggestions, we have corrected the error. You can find the modified content in L321-L322 and L434 of the revised manuscript.

Comments 3: 434-438: The two sentences “Firstly, the shape similarity…” and “The method of…” are duplicated two times. Remove the duplicates.

Response 3: Thank you very much for your correction. Based on your suggestion, we removed "Firstly, the shape similarity … ". You can find the modifications in L434-L436 of the revised manuscript.