Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

Point 1: A few figures are left out from the manuscript (e.g., Fig. 4 b, d, and f), etc. Section 3.1.5 is reduced Section 3.2 has been slightly completed Section 4.3.3 has been added Section 4.4. has been completed Conclusions are slightly changed Other minor changes and improvements

Response 1: Modified according to reviewer's comments for Fig 2, Fig 3, Fig 4, Fig 5 and Fig 6. (lines 16-21, 19-24, 235-236, 249-250, 270-271). When reviewed the figures, we found that the original figures were wrong in Figure 2. The figures we originally wanted to present are the six types of signals simulated with an SNR of 9 dB in this manuscript. However, the original figures are the six types of signals simulated with noise free environment. We have modified and further compared with figure 3. (lines 192 - 194). In addition, the structure of the article was slightly adjusted about Section 4.2.2. (lines 445-463)

Point 2: Six types of signals are described in the article (chapter 3.1.1). These are used to verify the authors’ algorithms – ACFICT. Is it possible to use a real sample of a real signal, including the potential noise, multipath propagation, etc…?

Response 2: The reviewer's comments are very forward-looking. The next step that our team plans to do is to verify the actual algorithm. We will design many factors that influence the actual condition, because signals generated by different types of electromagnetic sources are in many situations noisy, misshaped or changing in relation to the weather condition, task and application. In this case, we will use the software radio system to sample the actual data to verify the algorithm proposed in our study.