Responses to Reviewers’ Comments

The manuscript has been revised carefully according to the reviewers’ comments of Round 2. In order to make the revising contents more clearly, the changes will be highlighted in Yellow.

Reviewer #3

Detailed comments:

Comment 1: I do not find any detailed responses to each concern of the reviewer. Furthermore, the self-plagiarism problem is not yet resolved. In Section 1, 2.2, 3.1, 4.2, I still find the number of same sentences with respect to their previous papers [1, 2].


Response: Thanks for the reviewer’s comments. We want to apologize that we misunderstood the reviewer’s comments of Round 1. We only focus on explaining the self-plagiarism problem in Section 4.2 which is due to the application of the same self-developed USV physical model. According the reviewer’s comments of Round 2, we have updated the recently published references in Section 1, and Section 2.2. Furthermore, we have simplified the description of conventional PSO in Section 3.1 to avoid too much self-plagiarism. Please see details in Line 49-59, 60-62, 69-72; Line 130-135, 138-140; Line 181-183.