Reviewer #1 comments

The goal of this paper, as exposed by the authors, is to evaluate the use of VMAF in a different type of applications. The Introduction: 1.1 State-of-the-Art section (from 19 to 63) seems to be identical with [22] reference. Using a plagiarism detection software, I identify similarities with existing sources 30% (12%: “Boni García, Micael Gallego, Francisco Gortázar, Antonia Bertolino. Understanding and estimating quality of experience in WebRTC applications, Computing, 2018”). Please clarify the differences of the current manuscript.

· Author Action Point (AAP): The state-of-the-art section of the article was based on our previous work “Understanding and estimating quality of experience in WebRTC applications, Computing”. In order to avoid duplicity, the common parts of this section have been rephrased, and new references have been added as explained later.

The introduction sections include also the related work. Maybe it's better to write it separately. Related work section must contain actual works in the field, and should be improved with a comparative study between them.

· AAP: To solve this issue, the contents of section “1.1 State-of-the-Art” and “1.2 Motivation and Contributions” has been reordered. Specifically, the related work has been moved from 1.1 to 1.2 since it fits better in the context of the motivation of the paper. Now, the section 1.2 of the revised version explains that VMAF has been traditionally used to optimize the bitrate of TCP-based streaming services but in this paper, we hypothesize that it can be also used in WebRTC. Finally, this section is concluded by enumerating clearly the contributions of the paper.

The experimental data of the paper is relatively full. It's interesting to consider tests that include congestion or traffic constraint and different QoS scenarios.

· AAP: Although we agree that it would be interesting considering additional QoS scenarios such as congestion or other traffic constraint, we consider it as out of the scope of the paper (we focus in packet loss in this work). Nevertheless, we have added an additional paragraph about this idea as future work in the discussion section.

Update the Reference section, introducing new interesting MDPI articles recently published. The authors should clearly clarify the contributions for this paper.

· AAP: The section 1.2 has been rewritten to clearly enumerate the contribution of the paper. Moreover, extra MDPI references has been included, namely:
