Manuscript ID: polymers-892066
Type of manuscript: Article
Title: Study of the Influence of Technological Parameters on Generating Flat Part with Cylindrical Features in 3D Printing with Resin Cured by Optical Processing
Authors: Aurel Tulcan *, Mircea Dorin Vasilescu *, Liliana Tulcan *
Received: 22 July 2020, Response from reviewer: 15 Aug 2020 22:31:21, Received: 16 Aug 2020
Responding to reviewer: 19.08.2020 (GMT +2) 13:30,

# Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

Dear authors
While the experimental method used is simple, it is easily understandable in it approach to deformation measurements. It is thus helpful in identifying and better understanding the impact supports have on ***the various features of a SLA-built part***.

In the paper, the author presented the ***DLP 3D printing process*** (e.g. Line 12, 43, 60, 62, 64, 68, 179 and 245) for making parts, not the SLA process. There are differences between these two technologies of printing. The authors hope ***it is possible to be a misunderstanding.***

I have however, the following remarks to improve the quality of the paper:

- You have mentioned the meshing refinement in section 2.3 and developed a bit on that. There is however no follow-up in the experimental section on any possible effects. Experimental data are required to be added, or this topic could be withdrawn from this paper and expanded in further studies.

  Response 1. Section 2.3 has been removed. This part presented the error from the CAD generation of the body element, which is printed.

- There are too many figures in section 3.2, making it hard for the reader to follow through your line of thoughts. While those figures are helpful in identifying trends, some of these could be placed as Supplementary material, keeping the meaningful figures in the text.

  Response 2. We have reduced the number of figures in part 3 and section 3.2, by transferring them into the Appendix, as another reviewer has also suggested.

- There is no conclusion *per se*, only the Discussion section. A general conclusion needs to be added to summarize the work. Only tidbits of conclusion are found in the various parts of section 4.

Response 3. We have added two general conclusions after the modified structure of the conclusions, as another reviewer has also suggested.

- The comments found in the discussion section are sometime hard to understand and visualize on the piece, especially when a specific position is mentioned. Maybe a figure with the piece and some identifiers would be helpful.

Response 4. To a better understand the experimental strategy of each phase, detailed (specific) figures of the measured part have been added. Some of the comments were transferred to the experimental part for a better explanation of the finality of the experiments. Taking into account the previous observation all graphs named Contours of Estimated Response Surface were completed with the dash lines for determining the point values and the guidelines for identifying the point in the graphs.

- Some of the comments in the discussion need to be rewritten as they are more descriptive than trying to explain a phenomenon.

Response 5. This section has been completed with the centralized information and the addition of paragraphs to conclude for each experiment.

- Proof-reading by a native or fluent English speaker is needed to correct the text.

Response 6.
Grammatical aspects: Three UK English editor was used to write the Article. The first text of the Article had the level of ***grammatical errors of less than 0.1% for the whole text***.

Text first analysis of the Article was made using a Professional UK English editor:
Abstract 198 words, one word error UK English.
Part 1. 396 words, two words error UK English.
Part 2. 1879 words, five words error UK English.
Part 3. 5169 words, seven words error UK English.
Part 4. 1236 words, four words error UK English.

For the reviewed Article, a fluent English speaker have corrected the text.