Dear Reviewer,

Many thanks for your interest and efforts in reviewing our article named “Leveraging Artificial Intelligence and Provenance Blockchain Framework to Mitigate Risks in Cloud Manufacturing in Industry 4.0”.

We have conducted revisions based on your inputs as the following:

(a) Causal relationship has been established theoretically immediately after the sentence “The blockchain contract rules were configured in the form of predictive auditing such that the updates are accepted only when the risks predicted by AI are within the prescribed limit” in Section 2 (red colored text).
(b) General manufacturing comprises of PLCs working within localized manufacturing environments disconnected from the Internet. Hence, they were not exposed to cybersecurity threats. Cloud manufacturing is configured by interfacing PLCs with the Internet and hence is exposed to cybersecurity threats. We had tried to explain this in Section 1 for establishing the problem context. Following your feedback, we have added a dedicated statement (in red color) clearly stating this difference in their vulnerabilities.
(c) Latency and power limitations were raised by another reviewer, as well. We have provided a response immediately after the sentence “However, reallocations should always be done through new smart contracts such that the MQTT broker server and the machine learning rules could be updated” in Section 5 (blue colored text).
(d) Response to your fourth point is added in the Section 2 in red color;
(e) We have added a response to your concern on acceptance of the framework at the end of Section 4 (in red color).
(f) The scenario is of a multi-storey warehouse supporting cloud manufacturing. Yes we simplified it too much. We have modified the figure to show the racks and one reach truck forklift each in the three zones as was defined in the simulation scenario.
(g) Please allow us to continue with qualitative exploration, which may result in future in an empirical model. Currently there is no quantitative baseline to be tested against because this design idea itself is original.

We present our revised manuscript for your kind perusal and approval. We once again thank you for your valuable time and feedbacks given to our research.

With sincere regards

Corresponding Author