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We appreciate the time and efforts by the editor and referees in reviewing this manuscript. We have addressed all issues indicated in the review report, and believed that the revised version can meet the journal publication requirements. We have included the line numbers in the revised manuscript to help the reviewers identify our changes.

| **Comment** | **Response** | **Location of Response in Revised Manuscript** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **EDITOR’S COMMENTS** |  |  |
| Example :  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **REVIEWER A COMMENTS** |  |  |
| The introduction should be revised, 3 references appear on the introductionwhich somehow shows a lack of study. Some references are unclear whetherthey are from proceedings, journal or books. | We add short introduction about hyperspectral imaging system, and add more references | Section I |
| 1. The authors introduce some abbreviations such as SFS, FCS in the secondparagraph of introduction, but leave no explanations about thoseabbreviations. 2. The name of the feature selection technique presented in [2] should beelaborated, is that GMM?.3. The reference 3 is about comparison study of three different featureselection techniques. The difference in works with [3] should be wellexplained.4. The following sentences should be explained more clearly :The feature selection technique can be divided into 2 types: filter andwrapper [4]. Information gain (IG) [5], chi-square [6], and log like ratioexamples of feature selection with the filter types. As for the wrapper typeis forward and backward selection [4], relief [7], and infinite latentfeature selection.  [8]What makes them are classified as filter or warper should be described5. The link for dataset source should be provided6. The units for Fig.5 and 6 should be added, feature number and % accuracy? | 1. done2. done3. done4. repaired5. done6. done | 1. section 1, par.32. section 1, par.33.section 1, par 34.section 1, par 35. section 3, part A6. section 4, fig 6 & 7  |
| **REVIEWER B COMMENTS** |  |  |
|  Name of x and y axis is not mentioned for both of the presented graphs | done | section 4, fig 6 & 7 |
| what is the standard acceptable for accuracy measurement in featureselection technique of a hyperspectral image? Since the derived resultspresent less than 90% for maximum accuracy | There is no standard accuracy, since the aim of feature selection technique implementation is to reduce dataset dimension without reduce the accuracy |  |
| **REVIEWER C COMMENTS** |  |  |
| 1. The English quality should be significantly improved. Many parts containa quite great number of grammatical errors and this should be fixed.2. I would still find the paper lacks in literature survey. I suggest theauthor to improve the literature survey and adding more related studies tothe field. I would also suggest the author to add the rationale of whychoosing ILFS and relief as the method. 3. The methods are not clearly describe. I suggest to divide Sec. III intotwo sections: Proposed method and experimental setup. The method should be explained in more clear way in separate sections.4. Some figures should be improved. What are the axis in Fig. 5 and 6? Thelines should be made different by authors so it is readable when using blackand white. The tables should also be made to be more clear. The authorsshould explain every table. | 1. done, 2. done, 3. done4. done | 1. all2. section 13. section 2 part B4. section 4, fig 6&7 |
| 1. The authors do not really proposed new method but basically using anexisting method to a new problems. But what concern me more is there is noreal reasons why the authors choose these methods. The rationale should bemade clear. The authors should also made it more clear on why using SVM forclassification and why using RBF kernel with gamma 0.1 for it. There aremore than one hyper parameters for RBF kernels and this is not explained bythe authors how these parameters is set. I suggest the authors also show theresults using various kernels for SVM. \2. The authors should clearly explain the results of the paper rather thanpointing the results as we can all see that. But what are the causes of suchresults, can the author explait it further? | 1. done, we have add a reference that stating that these parameter produce best performance in HSI land classification2. done, we have add an explanation why the propose algorithm give better performance.  | 1. section 3. Part b, last paragraph2. section 4, par 6 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |