

Response to Reviewer 3 Comments

Round 2

We would like to thank the editors and reviewers for their valuable time and feedback. All comments were helpful in revising and improving our paper. We have studied them carefully and made the due corrections in the revised version of the manuscript that we hope will meet your approval.

Please note that the reviewers' comments are below with our responses in red. The main changes are summarized below and as well as in the manuscript

Comments and Suggestions for Authors:

The authors have somewhat addressed most of my comments. However, they did not reflect their rebuttals in the manuscript.

R/. Thanks for pointing this out. The manuscript was improved according to your comments and responses on Round 1. At this time the manuscript has been revised and adjusted again according to this and following comments. All of them can be viewed in the latest version of the manuscript, where improves were done using "Track changes" function using MSWord

English language has not been sufficiently improved.

R/. The manuscript has been reviewed by an English language editor.

Information about driven lengths has not been included in the manuscript.

R/. Thanks for this comment. This information has been included in the manuscript (see page 8).

How drivers ensured that speed remained constant during the experiment has not been included.

R/. Thanks for pointing this out. Description about this topic was included in the paper (see page 8).

A justification for low test speeds is missing.

R/. Thanks for the suggestion. In the manuscript (Round 1) is explained how the maximum speed was selected to be tested. In the new version of the manuscript (Round 2) the point about low speed is included. The low speeds used in tests were selected considering to have at least 2 more values for them according to the methodology used in the research, other speed trucks observed in the road and capability to maintain them controlled (see page 9).

In order to justify the variables of each model, their p-value should be included as well as the significance level considered. If these results are in accordance with literature, then it should be stated explicitly in the manuscript.

R/. Thanks for pointing this out.

In page 11 it is presented that the confidence level considered was 95%; (the significance level was 0.05).

About p-value: for all variables and their interactions p-value are less than 0.05; so, all of them are significant, p-values obtained were 0.04, 0.009, 0.008, 0.001 and less. This information is included in the manuscript in page 11.

The concept of weight ratio is still missing in the manuscript.

R/. Thanks. In pages 11 and 12 this concept is included.