1. Rather than DFAM or TO for AM, the design procedure presented in the paper seems to be a generic TO process that does not consider AM. What specific design strategies for AM have been added to the proposed TO procedure?

Reply to the first comment:

> When considering a specific manufacturing technology (SLM), the requirements and modifications of the TO for the given components were applied in certain steps of the mentioned process, such as in the mesh creation and analysis (chapter 2.2.2.4.), in the specifying of the optimization conditions (chapter 2.2.2.6.) and in the preparation for 3D printing (chapter 2.2.5.).

2. When selecting a specific build direction for 3D printing with SLM, the optimal geometry may require a support structure. Were any design constraints related to support structures (e.g., overhang constraints) considered for optimization?

Reply to the second comment:

> The SLM technology requires support structures and support materials, but these have not been considered in the simulation due to their influence on the final results of the designed components. The support structures were only considered in preparation for 3D printing (Chapter 2.2.5.).

3. If not, please discuss the limitations of the design process in this paper regarding build direction or support structure issues.

Reply to the third comment:

> The design limitations were stated in the optimization conditions (Section 2.2.2.6.) and resulting from the mesh analysis and creation (Section 2.2.2.4.), where it is known that the thickness of the individual component parts must be 3 times the mesh element size. Supporting structures were only considered in preparation for 3D printing (chapter 2.2.5.).

4. The paper contains typographical errors, as seen in lines 51, 53, 107, 232, etc. Please review your paper carefully to ensure that it is typo-free.

Reply to the fourth comment:

> The errors have been corrected, but after editing some parts of the article, the corrections are no longer placed in the corresponding lines.

5. Section 2.2.1 introduces the two-iteration development process as a traditional design method, so please add any relevant references.

Reply to the fifth comment:

> References to the iterations in chapter 2.1.1. have been added.

6. In section 2.2.2.8, please add a citation related to Cuţting Value in the manuscript.

Reply to the sixth comment:

> The citations have been added.

7. How do we choose the optimal CV values? How can we quantitatively determine if it is a nice continuous shape without defects as mentioned on line 366?

Reply to the seventh comment:

> The optimal CV values have been chosen according to the weight reported at a given CV, which should be closest to the weight after optimization. When generating the concepts and therefore editing the CV parameter, the software is adapted to create surfaces using tangent connections, resulting in a nice continuous shape without defects.

8. In section 2.2.3, how can we check if trimming the optimized geometry is likely to cause structural performance changes in the components?

Reply to the eighth comment:

> The check was carried out in the next step (2.2.4. Validation of the final design), where a strength analysis was performed.

9. In Figure 17, there are two final designs, what is the difference between the two designs?

Reply to the ninth comment:

> Figure 17 was one final design of the front mount, but in two views. That image is no longer part of the redesigned article. The design of both components is currently shown in Figure 17.

10. In Figures 13, 14, and Table 2, use "." instead of "," for the decimal point.

Reply to the tenth comment:

> An adjustment has been made.

11. In Table 2, it shows that 75 hours of development time is required for both designs, regardless of the shape and condition of the parts. Why does it take the same development time to design a front holder and a rear holder?

Reply to the eleventh comment:

> The value of the development time by conventional design methods is obtained from the concrete manufacturer for the product series of which both components are part. The development time is therefore the same for both components.

12. In the discussion section, it is necessary to discuss in detail why the design process can be effectively utilized in the context of additive manufacturing and DFAM. As mentioned in comment 1, I am still concerned about whether the proposed design process includes the essential design steps only for AM.

Reply to the twelfth comment:

> The discussion section has been modified to talk in detail about the effective use of a given design process in the context of AM and DfAM. The above design process can be generalized, but the use and application of TO for other manufacturing technologies is not as effective. An orientation to the design process for AM (SLM) is provided in response to the first comment.

13. There is no conclusion section in the manuscript. Please add one.

Reply to the thirteenth comment:

> The conclusion has been added.

14. Please correct reference 16 and add the author's name and the title of the paper.

Reply to the fourteenth comment:

The reference 16 has been corrected. It is currently marked as reference 9.