RESPONSES TO REVIEWERS' COMMENTS

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their careful read and constructive feedback on the previous paper draft entitled **"VIoT: A Voice and IoT Controlled Unmanned Automated Vehicle"**. We have carefully considered their comments in preparing our revision, which has resulted in a manuscript that is clearer, more compelling and broader.

Reviewers' Comments:

.....

Reviewer #1:

Comment#1: *Please add comparative performance evaluation graphs with clearly mentioning better performance than other projects.*

Response: Thank you for the recommendation. We also tried to introduce some type of performance evaluation graph in the previously submitted version. But most of the referenced papers themselves didn't have any clear graphical analysis to form a comparison. Again, our approach is much different to the referenced papers and thus is pretty difficult to draw any type of direct graphical analogy. So, in the end, we had to settle for a tabular performance analogy.

Comment#2: *Add the physical outlook of the project with proper annotations.*

Response: Thank you for the recommendation. The physical outlook of the project is a complex connection with the Rock Pi and the other components which could be difficult to understand and can be done in various ways depending on the user's preference. The important parts of the project such as IoT enabling and voice controlling are handled within the micro-controller by the help of python scripts and are not directly connected to the physical outlook. Thus, we only tried to focus on the key functionality diagrams instead of the physical outlook so that the users could easily understand the main purpose and functionality of the project.

Comment#3: *Why you are still working with Bluetooth to control within 20 m area? Why not control remotely from any place in the world?*

Response: Thank you for your comment. The project works in 2 communication modes as stated in section – III (B). Them being, (1) long-range control and (2) short-range control. The long-range control works using IoT features using web socket technology and works from anywhere in the world. The short-range control works using Bluetooth technology within the specified 20 meters range. We can control the car from anywhere in the world using the long-range control system where as only for the short-range control system, it is limited to the 20 meters range. The distinction between these two methods is done due to Bluetooth having less delay compared to web socket and when being within the 20 meters range, we will have an improved performance in terms of delay.

.....

Reviewer #2:

Comment#1: *Abstract and conclusion should contain some quantitative data.*

Response: Thank you for the recommendation. We tried to include the most important quantitative data in the Abstract section with the short-range control working with in the 20 meters range. The other quantitative data is the delay comparison between database storage and using web socket. This data is not directly connected to our purpose and thus is omitted from both Abstract and Conclusion as it is a comparison-based data that can differ based on internet speed and other network related circumstances and is not a constant value.

Comment#2: *References are not as format of the conference.*

Response: Thank you for the recommendation. Few of the reference papers are taken from Springer and other reputed publishers and so, the citations were not formatted in the specified standards. We addressed this and fixed the citations according to the conference standards.

.....

Reviewer #3:

Comment#1: *The quality of the figures is not good. It should be improved.*

Response: Thank you for the recommendation. The figure quality is addressed and we tried to improve them as much as possible.

Comment#1: *Fig.1 and Fig.3 should be cited (if copied from other).*

Response: Thank you for the recommendation. The figures are completely self-made and are not copied from any other source.