Response to Reviewer’s Comments

We would like to thank the editor and all the reviewers of our submitted manuscript Sensors-516766, entitled “Low-Slow-Small (LSS) Target Detection based on Micro Doppler Analysis in Forward Scattering Radar Geometry”. Here we have modified the paper for resubmission according to the reviewer’s suggestions and comments.

The authors have managed to answer almost all the reviewer comments and suggestions.

**REVIEWER 4**

**General comment**
The paper reads well and is well presented. The good paper with practical relevance with validation setup through simulation supports the intended application. A few corrections are required:

1) The reviewer’s comment:
   “In Fig1.a) Wd must change to wd/2”

**Response:**
Firstly, we would like to thank the reviewer for this observation, we really appreciate that. The observation was noted and corrected in the updated version “now Fig 2” of this manuscript.

2) The reviewer’s comment:
   “In eq 5 and 6, the author should mention what is θ0”.

**Response:**
Thank you for highlighting this issue also; the equations (5) and (6), “now (6) and (7)” in the updated version of this manuscript, θ₀ is initial angle of rotation of the blade. It is the initial angle at which the blade started rotating. This is explained in the updated version of this manuscript, line 239-242.

3) The reviewer’s comment:
   “Fig 16 and Fig 17 is better to present both results in the same span in X-axis”.

**Response:**
We appreciate your recommendation regarding Fig 16 and Fig 17 “now Fig 18 and Fig 19” in the updated manuscript. Yes, the Figures can be in the same span of X-axis; but, for clarity we decided to treat them individually regarding their discussion especially that the simulation is spread over a period of 1 s. While for the experimental STFT representation, only the signature occupies the period of 1 s.

Regards
RSA Raja Abdullah