METHOD

The authors present keywords and sources for their literature research, but they do not inform how many papers were found, how they selected the included papers, how they excluded papers, and the reasons why findings were excluded. I found that application of the presented keywords as stated in table 1, gives quite many hits in several scientific sources. By simply using Google Scholar, one of the sources presented by the authors, I got 33200 hits in the period 2007-2023 defined by the authors, and even 8000 hits after 2022. Of course, this contains a lot of insignificant sources and varying quality, but it illustrates a major challenge that must be addressed and explained to the reader. The background for the included articles and how they represent state of the art covering the last 16 years of 'existing bibliography', must be clearly defined.

Thanks a lot for your kind comment and for splitting your review into different sections. It helped us a lot indeed. The chosen references are published either in JCR indexed journals or in relevant proceedings and congresses. We prioritized articles with more cites than the average. In order to limit the vast amount of articles that you mention, we chose the most relevant results showed by the search engines, which included the 15 first pages. Moreover, we made discards of papers after reading the abstract and the titles of the articles, because we searched for research works that proposed different control systems or cable modelings.

The title states 'a comparative study of aerial transportation or suspended cable payloads with quadrocopters'.

It is unclear to me how this 'comparative approach' is applied and what the outcome is. There is a presentation of 148 cited papers, but the extent of the presentation from the differing publications varies a lot across the papers cited. Some just briefly, others in some detail. A clear systematic analysis is not obvious to me. The tables 2 and 3, summing up the listed papers, does not present a clear strategy for the synthesis of a 'comparative study'. It may very well be my fault, but I did not catch the 'comparative dimension' in this setup. May be a column stating pro et cons could have enriched the presenting tables. As it is, I observe the major body of the text as a listing of different papers of topics. The intention may be good, but it is completely left to the reader what's the main pros and cons and value of the each paper and this articles contribution.

Dear reviewer, thanks a lot for your valuable comment. The comparative approach of our article is based on chronological advancements. In the descriptions of different methods, modelings and control strategies, we tried to highlight which were the characteristics of each of them, and then, we mention the limitations that leaded to a later technical advancement or system modeling. For instance, taut cable model was useful and valid, till research community perceived that it did not represent reality well in aggressive maneuvers, and therefore, scientists developed other cable proposals.

In order to enhance the clarity of the paper, we removed the two summary tables and added a long Discussion part, where we extract some conclusions out of the analyzed bibliography, and we finally make a subjective evaluation of different techniques and how should future research be directed to improve in the state of art of this field. We consider

that this lets clear the “comparative” perspective, as we compare methods and choose which is “the best one”. Please, see lines 503-542 to read the new longer Discussion.

There is a somewhat confusing terminology related to the aircrafts. It is very well known in the literature that there are several synonyms for drones/UAVs/multicopters. The authors use UAV, quadrocopter, robot body in a mixture that cause challenges for the reader. Is the use of these interchanging terms reflecting differing physical structures, or is it just a varying terminology/names for the same structure? In the latter case, why use differing terms?

Thanks a lot for your comment. These terms in our article have the same meaning, and are used as synonyms.

As mentioned previously, I do not find the comparative dimension very obvious, and the multiple topics presented is not clearly summarized into an overall conceptual conclusion. There should be a more clearly defined ‘RESULTS’ section where the major findings, as interpreted by the authors. are portrayed.

Thanks a lot for your valuable opinion. As we mentioned before, we added a longer Discussion section, where we extracted conclusions and technological trends out of the analyzed bibliography, and give our opinion on which should be next steps to advance in the state of art. Please, see lines 503-542.

DISCUSSION

The discussion is rather brief, and as I see it, does not compensate for the above missing thematic.

As we mentioned earlier, we carried out a major revision on Discussion section and added various new paragraphs to cover different conclusions and other aspects related to this article and research field.

In the statement ‘the bibliography of cooperative transport of suspended payloads is still one step behind individual transport’, I assume ‘individual’ is related UAVs operating single-handedly? Or other?

Thanks a lot for your comment. You are right about the term “individual”.

I believe that the paper may be improved by a more limited focus and a more detailed presentation and discussion related to the ‘comparative’ perspective as announced in the title. Filling a potential gap in mathematical modelings and experiments could be discussed in the perspective of what are the major challenges in obtaining such models for real life, outdoor applications. Also, a discussion of this topic related to the extremely fast development of unmanned aircrafts with very heavy cargo capacities may possibly influence the long-run need for ‘team’ UAVs?

Thanks indeed for your nice suggestion. We are aware of this fast advancement you talk about. However, we consider that quadrotors with heavy cargo capacities correspond to quadrotors carrying their payload attached to the body, mostly. And this group falls out of the current scope of our article.

I am sorry to say that I did not find this paper as a solid base and starting point to introduce the state of the art to newcomers.

Thanks a lot for your opinion. We hope indeed that with the major revision that we carried out, the article is now better suited for newcomers to the field.

The paper needs English editing as there are multiple misspellings and statements that are not easy to understand.

Thanks a lot for reviewing our article. We carried out a complete grammar revision of the text, solved many issues, typos and improved our writing style to let the text clearer.