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] Various figures have been added to illustrate the papers. A more detailed response has been given in reply to reviewer#2 below.
* 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] Conclusion section has been re-written. Various people will reach an answer regarding the best solution based on their preference. For example, one industry practitioner may prefer a communication assisted scheme to eliminate the possibility for distance protection misoperation. Another engineer, may disagree with this scheme as it poses a cyber-security risk to the power system which is a critical infrastructure. The authors feel that the best solutions to distance protection misoperation are the ones that use no communication links as they pose no cyber-security threat. The authors also think that the most promising methods are the ones that uses local relay data to enhance distance relay security. However, the methods in this category have known shortcomings and future research is still needed to fully gauge the usefulness of these methods.

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
* 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] Various figures have been added to illustrate the papers. We have tried our best to give the best figure that explains the idea behind the papers 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 last manuscript latex 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] Various figures have been added to illustrate the papers.
* 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.
* 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 improved