Dear reviewers,

Thank you for your time to review our paper. We truly appreciate all your helpful comments, suggestions, and corrections for improving this paper. In response to your suggestions, we have outlined the changes and provided the necessary explanations.

In response to the comments of Reviewer #1:

-- Since Sections 3 and 4 are independent of 5, and 5 does not concern capture time, I would move Section 5 so it is before Sections 3 and 4.

**The basics of the strategy used in Section 3 (Capture time of Cartesian product) is discussed in Section 2, and limited capture time (Section 4) should come after Section 3. Since sections 2, 3, and 4 are chained together, we believe that the proof of NP-hardness should be placed in Section 5.**

Abstract (and Introduction)

-- P1 L40: The statement “The initial arrangement that (the) zombie player chooses is essential for him to win.” should not be in the definition of the game. (You could include it afterward when analyzing the game)

**This was moved to the end of the paragraph after the definition is completed.**

-- P1 L41: In the description of the game you should specify that the players alternate turns.

-- P2 L10: “vertex set of” should be “vertex set”

-- P2 L18: “Goes to infinity” should be “is infinite”

-- P2 L40, 42, 45, 49: Since it is named, I prefer “Section X” to “section x”

**We applied these changes in this revision.**

Zombie number of the Cartesian product of two graphs

-- P3 L18: The statement “(x, y) is the vertex where the survivor is located” is only used in the proof of Theorem 2 and should be moved there.

-- P4 L 17: “lemma 1” should be “Lemma 1”

**We applied these changes in this revision.**

Capture time in Cartesian product of graphs

-- P5 L12: “Let rad(G) represent the G’s radius.” should be changed to “Given a graph G, let rad(G) denote its radius.”

**We applied these comments in this revision.**

Limited capture time zombie number problem is NP-Hard

-- P6L31: I would change the notation {(u,1≤i≤k)} to {(u,v):1≤v≤k}.

**We have changed these in this revision.**

In response to the comments of Reviewer #2:

-- I don't think that italics are needed for "capture time" in the final line of the Abstract.

-- P3, Lines 6 and 7: say "subgraph of $G \Box H$ induced by" instead of just "subgraph induced by"

-- P3, L16. I think "Denote" would be more suitable than "Define" when introducing the notation for the length of a path. -- P2. Lines 39-47. Don't say "2", "3", etc. Say "Section 2", etc.

**We applied all these corrections in this revision.**

-- P5, Section 3. When introducing the notation $rad(G)$ it might be helpful to remind the reader of its definition. It would also be good to use notation consistently... there is an instance of $radius(H)$ later in this section.

**The radius(H) was changed to rad(H). To define radius, eccentricity was also defined to make this definition more understandable.**

-- P7, Line -16 to -13: $k$ has not been clearly defined. I would suggest changing line -16 to say "... one of them, say $B\_k$, is initially free ..."

-- The 2nd and 3rd last paragraphs on page 7 refer to the parts of a partition as partitions in their own right. Please use the word "parts" to refer to the parts of a partition.

**We have changed these in this revision.**

-- Reference [6] does not appear to be cited in the paper. It should either be cited or removed.

**We used this in the our summary next to \cite{Kinnersley15} since they both concern complexity of cops and robbers game.**

In response to the comments of Reviewer #3:

2. Required References

1: Reference was added, it is also used next to [2].

2: We used this in the our summary next to \cite{Kinnersley15} since they both concern complexity of cops and robbers game.

3. Grammatical Suggestions

1,2: Changed.

3: The whole definition was changed based on Reviewer #1 and #2 suggestions.

4,5,6,7,8,9: Changed.

10: Changed as you suggested, only the word “partition” was changed to “part” as Reviewer #2 suggested.