Response to Reviewer 1 Comments

**Point 1:** The paper was interesting but with using checkmarks instead it makes one wonder if it’s a viable project. I would also think about reliability it was missing.

**Response 1:** We evaluate our proposed protocol based on ideal PUF by a formal verification tool, Scyther. The outcome is presented in Section 5.3. Considering the reliability of PUF, we propose an enhanced protocol for noisy PUFs in Section 4.5. The implementations of our protocols are discussed in Section 7.