The authors would like to thank the associate editor as well as the reviewers for their valuable feedback and their interest in the paper. The following is a summary of the answers to the questions raised by the reviewers (the four questions raised by the reviewers are in **bold red**):

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1

* It would be good for readers of the Journal if the authors give some figures and distance relay plots with impedance trajectory and additional equations to describe measures in chapters 3, 4 and especially in chapter 5. [Authors] Figures 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 have been added. We have tried our best to give the best figure that explains the idea behind the paper reviewed but this was not always possible due to the complexity or the idea of some papers. For example in [30], if we choose to elaborate more on the paper and provide a figure about the slave and master agents then we will have to provide much more explanation within the paper about how the author selected their agents. However, the main idea in [30] is to select these agents to minimize the communication latency. Thus, giving a figure without explain the optimization process would not, in our own opinion, add much to the paper and may raise more questions. The same goes for [37] in which has been used as a trip restraint. We couldn’t come up with a figure that would better explain the idea in this paper better than what we have already explained within the paper. The argument for using can only be understood by showing some simulation results which would lengthen the paper unnecessarily.
* From conclusion and the whole paper nobody can make decision which method of mitigation of zone 3 misoperation is the best. Please let authors be more precisely in the conclusion. There is many "however" in the conclusion. [Authors] The conclusion section has been re-written. The most appropriate method to mitigate zone 3 misoperation is dependent on what is the most important factor for the utility company. For example, one utility company may prefer a communication-assisted scheme using remote measurements to eliminate the possibility for distance protection misoperation while accepting the cybersecurity vulnerabilities that are introduced. Another utility may not be willing to accept the cybersecurity risks or the cost of constructing such scheme and requires a solution using local measurements or minimum remote measurements. The authors think that methods which use local relay data are worthy of research attention as cybersecurity threats are becoming a major concern.

Reviewer #2

* Although Abstract is concise, it would be useful to add one or two sentences with aim to explain introduced classification of reviewed articles. [Authors] Abstract has been improved per reviewer’s input.
* For readers and future researchers, it would be very useful to introduce a few more illustrations related to most important review articles (e.g. references [25], [30], [37], [45] and [46]). A few figures explaining the basic idea behind proposed solutions from articles can be of great value for readers (good figure can replace whole paragraph). [Authors] Figures 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 have been added. We have tried our best to give the best figure that explains the idea behind the paper reviewed but this was not always possible due to the complexity or the idea of some papers. For example in [30], if we choose to elaborate more on the paper and provide a figure about the slave and master agents then we will have to provide much more explanation within the paper about how the author selected their agents. However, the main idea in [30] is to select these agents to minimize the communication latency. Thus, giving a figure without explain the optimization process would not, in our own opinion, add much to the paper and may raise more questions. The same goes for [37] in which has been used as a trip restraint. We couldn’t come up with a figure that would better explain the idea in this paper better than what we have already explained within the paper. The argument for using can only be understood by showing some simulation results which would lengthen the paper unnecessarily.

Reviewer #3

* The paper requires editing in general. [Authors] The authors have done their best to review the paper and make sure that it is free from spelling and grammatical errors. We are using Elsevier.cls latex class and unfortunately, we don’t have access to the final manuscript template that is used by the journal to be able to fully edit the paper.
* Add figure and table that shows the distance relay security to prevent distance protection misoperation that were published in periodicals. [Authors] Figures 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 have been added.
* Literature review should be provided properly to clear the importance of authors' work. [Authors] The authors did their best to organize the literature into coherent categories. We have surveyed various research databases to obtain all literature needed. We eventually found that the research efforts made by previous authors can be classified into three major categories. These categories are explained in the paper.
* The conclusions are not clear. The Conclusion section should be more detailed and definite. [Authors] Conclusion has been re-written.
* The paper abstract shall be revised and improved with aim to express the novelty of contribution. [Authors] Abstract has been re-written with that aim in mind.