

Responses to Review Remarks

Dear reviewer,

First of all, I would like to express my respect for your responsible and careful peer review. Thank you for your valuable comments and allowing a resubmission of our manuscript.

We are uploading (a) our point-by-point response to the comments (below), (b) an updated manuscript with 2 parts, the one with yellow mark on the changes and the one without yellow mark.

We have revised the paper in our best efforts. However, we are open to revise further should any further suggestion from the reviewer be offered. Thank you for your time and efforts on this paper.

I. MAJOR DIFFERENCE FROM THE PREVIOUS VERSION

1. Section 1 (Introduction) and Section 5 (Experiment verification) is revised to clarify the significant contribution and innovation of this article.

2. All the mathematical formulas have been checked carefully and center aligned. All formulas have been standardized in uniform format.

3. In Section 2 and Section 3, the unclear parameter descriptions in the previous version have been clarified in the revised version, and the explanations on the effect and value determination of parameters in our model are also added.

4. The control cycle of the entire algorithm during actual operation is clarified.

5. The intuitive explanations and analysis of the application of the proposed

method have been supplied in the Section 5.2 so that the readers can have a clearer understanding of the theoretical part.

6. Three reference papers are added in Section References.

7. The unclear expressions and errors are revised carefully in the manuscript.

II. RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER

Overall, the paper appears to be well-written, and the proposed method and results are well-explained. The paper's use of theoretical analysis, simulations, and experiments demonstrates the robustness and effectiveness of the proposed synchronous planning method for collaborative manipulation of multi-arms robot.

I would believe that the paper can be more elaborated in its presentation and describing its novelty and contribution to the current technology, particularly in the state-of-the-art manipulators, but it is acceptable for publication in its present form, meeting the essential requirements under the Sensors' Journal's scope.

Reply 1:

Thank you very much for your efforts on handling this paper and for the whole evaluation of our work.