

Reviewer 1 (Associate Editor of the Journal)

Unfortunately, the paper wseas-712 cannot be published in its present form. The authors have to improve their paper.

References

The authors must improve their references:

Instead of

... by Horáček [1, p. 13].

they must write

... by Horáček, [1, p. 13].

Instead of

The Digital Command Control (*DCC*) [2] is ...

they must write

The Digital Command Control (*DCC*), [2], is ...

These are only some examples, but they must correct all the references inside their text, otherwise, their paper will not be published.

They must correct all the references inside their text, otherwise, their paper will not be published.

In general, a reference [n] must be inside the text as , [n], or as , [n].

That means that the [n] must be separated by punctuation marks.

To separate references use , not ;

Exceptions:

In [n] the authors (in this case you must not put comma)

According to [n] we have (in this case you must not put comma)

**Check if the in-text citations exist in the reference list
also Check if all the articles in the reference list exist in the in-text citations.**

**Check also if the in-text citations for Tables, Equations and Figures are
connected with Tables, Equations and Figures properly.**

Note, that WSEAS publishes articles that are 100% **correct in English** and the **Format**

See again <https://wseas.com/format.php>

Reviewer 2

Some points should be included within the manuscript in order to improve the publication.

- 1) Even though it is an interesting work and it is worthy of publishing, the practical applications of this study should be emphasized and analyzed in detail.
- 2) For readers to quickly catch the contribution in this work, it would be better to highlight major difficulties and challenges, and your original achievements to overcome them, in a clearer way in abstract and introduction.
- 3) The authors should summarize possible limitations and assumptions of the proposed digital control.
- 4) In section 2.7 (page 5), the authors claim that 'This is advantageous in view of possible further development, as the protocol can still be the same, although other types of modules with different characteristics may be added in the future.' It would be useful if the authors provide more details about this claim.

Reviewer 3

The comment regarding "Maintaining an authoritative version however, is handled by the computer, where all storage, backup and versioning of configurations can be handled elegantly and much more easily." should be better explained.

The conclusion section in the present form is relatively weak and should be strengthened with more details.

It is mentioned in section 4 that "Here a new field of application is emerging, for which the individual components are already prepared, but adaptation to commercial software systems has not yet been addressed." More justification should be furnished on this issue.

It is necessary that the authors clearly discuss how their work provides a contribution beyond alternative studies.