Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

1. Summary

Thank you for your suggestions on our manuscript entitled "CCBA-NMS-YD: A Vehicle Pedestrian Detection and Tracking Method Based on Improved YOLOv7 and DeepSort". We apologize that the last revision did not meet your requirements. We have carefully studied the suggestions and made changes that hopefully will meet with your approval.

2. Questions for General Evaluation	**Reviewer's Evaluation**	**Response and Revisions**
Does the introduction provide sufficient background and include all relevant references?	Must be improved	
Is the research design appropriate?	Must be improved	
Are the methods adequately described?	Must be improved	
Are the results clearly presented?	Must be improved	
Are the conclusions supported by the results?	Must be improved	

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

Comments 1: there are still sentences starting with "Literature...."

Response 1: Thank you for pointing this out. I apologize again, and I have now corrected the above errors in accordance with the common writing style in English-language journals (lines 45, 60, and 65 of the article)

Comments 2: There are many typos which needs professional proofreading.

Response 2: Thank you very much indeed for your comments. I apologize for the inconvenience. With the help of our three English major colleagues, we have corrected the typos that appeared in the article.(Lines 36 on page 1, 179 on page 4, 204 on page 5, 342 on page 9, 410 on page 12, and 445 on page 13 of the article)

Comments 3: I suggest the author provide the response to review with line and page references to the updated manuscript to highlight the changes made during the revision.

Response 3: Thank you very much for your reminder.

4. Response to Comments on the Quality of English Language

Point 1: English very difficult to understand/incomprehensible.

Response 1: Thank you very much indeed for your comments. We corrected grammatical errors that existed in the article and changed some statements to make them more fluent. In addition, keywords were changed to lowercase. The language of this article is American English.(Lines 10, 31, 38, 159 on page 4, 220 on page 5, 387 on page 11, and 481 on page 15 in

the article.)