First, we would like to thank both reviewers for their careful review and the editor for giving us the opportunity to address the comments. We have replied to and made the revisions based on the comments of reviewers. Attached please find the reply letter to the reviewers’ comments and the revisions in text. We have highlighted the revisions in our revised manuscript for your reference. Thank you so much for your consideration and we are looking forward to hearing from you soon regarding our resubmission!

Best regards,
Qing Su

Reviewer 2:
The manuscript is improved after revision, however some issues are still present.

1) Line 86-87: "To obtain a 5 at% He peak concentration, fluences of ...... ion/cm2 was implanted". For me this sentence means that the author chose ion fluences to obtain 5 at%, because this concentration is required for some purpose, which is not explained in the text. There is an explanation of the idea in authors reply to this question from my previous report, but it is not included in revised manuscript.

Authors’ reply: This is a very good comment. We have added the explanation into the revised manuscript.

2) The description of Fresnel contrast from bubbles "as dark dots surrounded by a bright fringe for the over - focus condition and bright dots surrounded by a dark fringe in the under - focus condition" is repeated twice in one paragraph: lines 140-141 and lines 147-148.

Authors’ reply: This is a very good comment. We have removed one statement from the paragraph.