

Response to Reviewer 4 Comments

Point 1: at the end of the introduction, the authors mention a Chapter. This is a paper or a Chapter?

Response 1: The presented manuscript is a research article. The word "chapter" was discarded.

Point 2: Also, a guided tour of the article is missing at the end of the Introduction.

Response 2: An overall guide for the article is added to the Introduction section (line 54, 55, 56).

Point 3: The discussion of results is poor and it is not contrasted with the literature available.

Response 3: The authors fully respect the reviewer's opinion. The authors used an example of a predictive model of the turbine generator of Novovoronezh NPP (description is included in the manuscript) to discuss the results received. Due to the fact that the model is new, there is no literature on it, and therefore, the reviewer and the authors could not have a base for comparison

Point 4,5: The methodology used for computing the costs is standard. The conclusions are poor.

Response 4,5: Again, the authors fully respect the reviewer's opinion. : The methodology seems trivial only at the first glance (like many things around us). However, the following aspects of the methodology were introduced for the first time: a)energy cost calculation method before and after implementation of digital technology; b)digital technology cost calculation method based on technology readiness level; c)methods for calculating economic and social efficiency after the implementation of digital technology. Hence, the authors would be grateful for references to academic papers where such "standard methodology" combined items a,b, and c is described to account for it in their research.

As for the last comment: "I do not see enough novelty in the article that deserves publication"- unfortunately, the authors do not see the usefulness of this recommendation to improve the quality of the article.