Dear Reviewer,

We appreciate you and the reviewers for your precious time reviewing our paper and providing valuable comments. Your valuable and insightful comments led to possible improvements in the current version. The authors have carefully considered the comments and tried our best to address every one of them. We hope the manuscript, after careful revisions, meets your standards. The authors welcome further constructive comments, if any.

Below, we provide the point-by-point responses. All modifications in the manuscript have been highlighted in red.

1. The introductory part of the abstract currently occupies almost half of it, that is too long. The abstract should be more focused on the authors' work. Maybe some more details of the study can be added for balance:
    - We agreed with your comments on the abstract, as in our opinion it is really important to provide some essential information about the spectrum of the article at the very beginning, however the abstract lacks detail about our proposed work. That is why we extended the abstract with a more detailed description of our work during the research.
2. In conclusion the authors honestly declare their method is slower than the rivals. However, I think more elaboration is needed here, including theoretical and numerical evaluation of the methods' complexities:
    - We did not measure and compare the exact time consumption of other solutions and architectures with our work. We cannot provide a numerical evaluation of the solution’s complexity. Despite that, we can provide some theoretical information about the complexity of our ensemble network and how some work can make improvements in that field in Section 4.

Sincerely,
Norbert Serban
serban.norbert@inf.unideb.hu
PhD student, Faculty of Informatics
University of Debrecen