Response to Reviewers

Manuscript ID: applsci-1008375
Type of manuscript: Article
Title: A smart algorithm for personalizing the workstation in the assembly process
Authors: Maja Turk, Miha Pipan, Marko Simic *, Niko Herakovic
Received: 4 November 2020
E-mails: maja.turk@fs.uni-lj.si, miha.pipan@fs.uni-lj.si, marko.simic@fs.uni-lj.si, niko.herakovic@fs.uni-lj.si
Submitted to section: Mechanical Engineering,
Correspondent author: Marko Simic, marko.simic@fs.uni-lj.si

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for taking the time to review the article for the second time. I really appreciate your final comments! Please find my responses in below and my corrections in the re-submitted file (using "Track Changes" function and additionally the "Comment" function). The new corrections within the round 2 are commented in the manuscript.

Thanks again!

Comments and a summary of the revision

Gender is still visible under Anthropometry, nevertheless it is not a feature of Anthropometry. Some other data can be inserted to maintain ellipse and arrows, but, as both ellipses points to same rectangles, only one ellipse can be used with generalized data types or short list of data types.
Thank you for pointing that out. We apologize for overlooking this mistake on first review. The figure has been corrected and replaced as recommended. Now gender is no longer among the anthropometric characteristics (row 237).
The quality of Figure 7 is not adequate. The dpi is low. If some segments should be hidden from wider audience, those should be blurred. Fig 8. have the same issue.
Thank you for observation. The quality of figure 7 (row 340) and figure 8 (row 372) has been corrected. The resolution of figures are now 300 DPI as defined in Instructions for Authors. We also upload new high-quality figures together with new corrected manuscript.
I am not sure that "the number of errors is reduced by more than 300%" is appropriate term. We have for example 11 and 3. When reducing from 11 to 3, we reduced the number of errors for approx. 73%. (or "for more than 72%")
Thank you for the comment. We fully agree and apologize for the incorrect wording. We corrected the mistake in section 3.2.2 (row 448) and in section "Conclusions" (row 512), as you suggested.