>>GR, R1, R2 Q: Restructure the paper. Introduce the robot platform used in the studies before the study results.

The work presented in the paper was thought to present our last work on emotion projection with a non-anthropomorphic platform. Therefore, the idea was to present the case study done to cross-validate the results obtained in the experiment. As a consequence, the idea was to present the experiment as antecedent of the case study. As reviewers suggested, re-organizing the paper will help to make clear this objective. More important, we consider that a clear explanation in the introduction about our previous work and clear outline of the work is missing, and it would help to clarify.

>>GR, R1, R2, and R3 Q: Consider emphasizing the Emotion Enrichment System.

A: This is a very nice suggestion. We did want to go much in detail about the system because that could have turn readers’ attention to this and not to the results obtained in the case study. As all reviewers suggested more information is required to improve the readiness. For example, the description of the grammar used to describe compound actions and emotions.

>>GR Q: I suspect the velocity values will be highly influenced by robot size and perceived mass. A large robot cart spinning with an angular velocity of 1 rad/s will look very different than a small, lightweight robot. This likely, strong bias is not captured in the study design nor is this limitation mentioned in the discussion.

A: This is a very nice point that we have considered. We are planning to do an experiment to study this.

>>GR, R1 Q: Improve connections to prior work in all aspects of the paper and expand the literature review.

A: We are more than gladly to extend it with the references suggested by R1, thanks for the information. On the other hand, summarizing literature review to point out their strengths and weaknesses in a readable way is possible due the detail analysis done for each work informed in the article. The main contribution in this paper respect the works informed is the creation of an emotional enrichment system and the cross-validation of our experiment results. This cross-validation is done to verify if the values found for our selected features are interpreted as it was expected. It is important to say that none of the works reported by us have done this type of cross-validation.

>>GR, R1, R2, R3 Q: Provide more details about the experiment methods and statistical analyses to increase reader comfort with the results.

A: The main objective was to present the cross-validation of the results obtained in the experiment and not the experiment. Therefore, it was decided just to introduce the experiment without going into details. Moreover we are working in an article where all the information about the experiment can be found and it will be included as a reference.

>>GR, R1, R2, and R3Q: Spend significant effort on general writing clarity and overall refinement. There are numerous problems with this paper for both basic English and research writing style. As an example for the latter, research using human measures generally use a threshold of p < 0.0001.

A: This is an issue that we are taking care of. And we understand the importance to make clear the article and follow strict research writing style

>>R1 Q: Unclear why case-study motion path was chosen, leaves out the potential importance of robot path shape (see additional suggested references)

A: the straight path was chosen to not have many independent variables. At the moment we had: linear and angular velocity, oscillation angle, direction (going towards or going far), and orientation. Introducing path would include several independent variables (e.g. smoothness, directness). This would reduce our understanding of the contribution of each feature.

>>R2 Q: I think also too initial and exploratory stage of research too

A: This is a nice comment because would mean that the reader would miss also miss the work done by us to arrive at this point and the reasons to do it in the way used by us. From example, after the literature review two approaches were identified: SAM or questionnaire with emotions listed. We decided to use the second due to the nature of the researchers’ night.

>>R3 Q: it is stated that not every emotion is shown an equal number of times. This makes the design unbalanced and the results are hard to interpret.

A: Due to the case was done in the researchers’ night. It was not possible to predict the number of participants in each presentation. More important the pair of emotions presented were generated beforehand randomly to avoid confounding.

>>R3 Q: The authors should clearly specify which question they are trying to answer and how the statistical test can answer this question.

A: stating the questions will give a better understanding on how the information was used and why that type of test was used.