Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your time and energy in reviewing this paper. We have found your suggestions very helpful and believe they have improved the manuscript significantly. Please see in line below for details about how each of your points were addressed. All major changes are tracked in red in the new manuscript.

Sincerely,
Authors

This is a work creating a method for creating expressive UAVs through an algorithmic procedure for creating variable motion. There are numerous ambiguous parts through the paper as follows.

1. I recommend inserting an overview diagram in Section 1 to help readers understand what authors try to deliver. The paper seems very verbose in explaining the method which makes hard to follow the intent of authors.

Thank you for this suggestion. Figure 2 is new and contains this overview, which is referenced at key points throughout the paper.

2. Please convert the verbose description of the methods into equations to make it brief.

It is important when transferring this holistic, embodied, and qualitative work to describe the choices we make in our approximations, which we hope will be somewhat accessible to those with a non-technical background. However, we note the reviewers’ important point that we failed to provide a summative equation that describes the crafted trajectories. A succinct equation (Eq. 7, which is new) is provided in Section 2.3.

3. Please provide the enough comparison result between the presented method and the general path planning method. With the comparison result, I can evaluate the advantage of the presented method.

We have clarified that Motion 1 is a generic path planner in Sections 2 and 3. This movement is simply a linear interpolation between way points.

4. In section 2, four motion factors including time, weight, space, and flow, in the LMA method is the concept created by Laban [22-24] and authors adapted the LMA methods for their purpose. To compare what is indeed improved compared to the original method, please provide a comparison result between two methods.

It is not possible to compare our work to Laban’s work with humans, which was completed in the early 1900s. But we have extended our discussion of the most comparable similar method in Section 5.1.