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| **Comments 2:** You need to include a table summarizing the key findings of each study, such as the sensors used, number of postures classified, classification accuracy, and user feedback mechanisms (if  any). | | |
| **Response 2:** As advised, Table 3 – (Summary of the short-listed papers), was added to the manuscript, The summary table highlighted the key findings in each paper, such as the sensor type, number of postures, classification method, classification accuracy, and user feedback. | | |
| **Comments 3:** The discussion section can be expanded to explore the potential implications of integrating multiple sensor types for enhanced posture classification and the challenges associated with such an approach. | | |
| **Response 3:**  Thank you very much for pointing this out. Furthermore, we have expanded on Section 6.1.1 (Multiple Sensor Types) (page 16 and 17) by exploring the potential implication of using multiple types of sensors in the classification of sitting postures. We also…. | | |
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| **Response 3:** We totally agree with this suggestion, in response to this we added Section 6.14 (Feasibility of Smart Sensing chair in the real-world setting) which discussed both the benefits and the challenges associated with the use of a smart sensing chair  in a real-world setting. | | |
| **4. Additional clarifications** | | |
| *[Here, mention any other clarifications you would like to provide to the journal editor/reviewer.]* | | |

## Reviewer 2 Report

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Response to Reviewer 2 Comments | | |
| **1. Summary** |  |  |
| Thank you very much for taking the time to review this manuscript. Please find the detailed responses below and the corresponding revisions/corrections highlighted/in track changes in the re-submitted files*.* | | |
| **2. Questions for General Evaluation** | **Reviewer’s Evaluation** | **Response and Revisions** |
| Is the work a significant contribution to the field? | A yellow star on a white background  Description automatically generated | *[Please give your response if necessary. Or you can also give your corresponding response in the point-by-point response letter. The same as below]* |
| Is the work well organized and comprehensively described? |  |  |
| Is the work scientifically sound and not misleading? | A yellow star on a white background  Description automatically generated |  |
| Are there appropriate and adequate references to related and previous work? |  |  |
| Is the English used correct and readable? |  |  |
| **3. Point-by-point response to Comments and Suggestions for Authors** |  |  |
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