Summary of Changes made, as requested by the reviewers

The authors thank the reviewers for their careful reading of the manuscript and for suggesting improvements to enhance its quality. The purpose of this document is to record exactly how we have endeavoured to address the concerns of the referees. In each case we quote the reviewer’s suggestion in black and document in blue what we did to address the problem.

Changes required by Reviewer B

1. In Section 2, the existing approaches are discussed. In some cases (especially 2.2 and 2.4), the description is very detailed and long. Is it necessary to provide so much detail, such as the derivations and the reasoning behind the approaches? I suggest providing much more summarised descriptions with just the essential information for implementation (and also important additional information that is not available in the references).

   Response: We started out attempting to implement this suggestion, but abandoned our attempt because we found that it detracts from the manuscript in the sense that it results in a paper that is neither self-contained nor comprehensible (it becomes too difficult to explain exactly in what context we made changes to existing algorithms from the literature). In any case, it would have shortened the paper by only one or two pages. We therefore decided to leave the exposition of the literature as detailed as it originally was.

2. In the conclusion I suggest removing the "As mentioned" at the start of the first sentence and stating the main conclusion first. When I read a paper, I read the abstract followed by the conclusion. Then I read the rest. I suspect that many others do the same. For that reason, I like conclusions that are self-contained. First state your main conclusion, then state that this does not corroborate with Einhorn.

   Response: We have changed the first paragraph of the conclusion entirely to satisfy the reviewer.

3. In Section 1, you state "... in a PhD dissertation by Einhorn [3], although the results were not published." A PhD is a form of publication, so I suggest taking out the last phrase.

   Response: The phrase has been deleted, as suggested by the reviewer.

4. Can you provide a source for reference [14]?

   Response: The reference has been corrected by providing more detail, as requested by the reviewer.

5. Section 1, 2nd paragraph, 1st sentence: I suggest removing "however".

   Response: The word ‘however’ has been deleted, as suggested by the reviewer.
6. Section 1, 2nd paragraph, 2nd sentence: I suggest removing "on the other hand" (because there is no first hand).

Response: The phrase “on the other hand” has been deleted, as suggested by the reviewer.

7. Page 2, 2nd paragraph: "Performance Measure Indicators" is given in italics. These are common concepts, so why format in italics? Also, the first letters are capitalised and should not be. When defining (spelling out) an acronym, the first letters should not be capitalised unless they would normally be capitalised, e.g. particle swarm optimization (PSO).

Response: The capitalisation has been removed, as suggested by the reviewer.

8. Page 13: "travelling straight through of the network" (in two places), remove "of"

Response: The word “of” has been deleted (twice), as suggested by the reviewer. We thank the reviewer for spotting these errors.

9. Section 5.1: "a couple of seconds" (in two places). Unless you mean exactly two, replace this with "a few seconds".

Response: The phrase “a couple of seconds” has been replaced by “a few seconds”, as suggested by the reviewer.


Response: The hyphenation has been corrected. We thank the reviewer for spotting this error.


Response: The words have been split. We thank the reviewer for spotting this typo.

12. Conclusion: "our model designed was purposefully built to...". There is something wrong here, possible alternatives: "our model was purposefully designed to...", "our model was purposefully built to..

Response: The Phrase “our model designed was purposefully built to...” has been replaced by “our model was purposefully designed to...”. We thank the reviewer for spotting this error.