Dear Editor,

Thanks again for the editorial job on our article

" **Can greedy-like heuristics be useful for solving the Weighted Orthogonal Art Gallery Problem under regular grid discretization?**"

which we submitted for eventual publication in the journal IJEEC.

We would also like to thank the Referees for their new comments. We have mainly accepted them in the revised version of the paper attached.

We responded to the Referees' comments in a separate letter as attached below.

Sincerely yours,

The Authors

**Answers to Reviewer A.**

The corrected version of the paper is significantly better than the initial version with corrected a number of technical and typo errors.  
If the answer of the authors is accepted that they did not want to create an algorithm that can be compared with the best algorithms but to create a simple, fast, and acceptable solution in terms of characteristics, then the paper can be published.  
Of course, in this case, authors should explicitly say in both the Introduction section and the Conclusion section what is the purpose of the paper (something like their answer to reviewers' comments).

**Answer**: We have added the two paragraphs displayed in red color on pages 2 and 9 that describe the goal and purpose of the work.

**Answers to Reviewer B.**

Overall, I believe the quality of the paper has improved. However, as in the previous review, while I think the problem is interesting and it may have interesting applications, I still don't believe the paper is ready for publication at this moment.  
According to the authors, their idea is not to beat any state-of-the-art technique, but to give a simple option for engineers in practical situations. I agree that this could be valuable. However, if that's the case, that should be stated very clearly in the paper. Also, as a suggestion, comparing with different greedy techniques from previous work could be an easier way to improve the results. Finally, as before, I strongly believe that the benchmark sets are too small and do not provide enough information about the quality of the results.  
  
**Answer**:

We appreciate Referee’s valuable comments. We would like to note that Referee A also suggested to include a short explanation regarding the purpose of our paper. So, we added on pages 2 and 9 short paragraphs to clearly describe the purpose and goal of our work. Also, we believe that in future work it could be useful to extend this research and to apply the algorithm to an extended benchmark set.

Here are some minor comments about the new changes to the paper:  
  
Page 2  
The citation of the AGP survey in the first paragraph seems to be wrong. Paper [6] is not a survey and I believe the survey on AGP algorithms is missing from the list of references. Please, consider adding it:  
Pedro J de Rezende, Cid C de Souza, Stephan Friedrichs, Michael Hemmer, Alexander Kröller, Davi C Tozoni: Engineering art galleries. Algorithm Engineering, 379-417 (2016)

**Answer:** We thank the Referee for this comment. We apologize for this mistake, which appeared during the technical preparation. In new version of the paper, the correct reference is included in the list of the references.

Page 8  
The explanation about the difference in time between W0 and W1 in the second paragraph seems incomplete. The difference in guards cardinality doesn't seem to be enough to explain the large difference in time. Profiling the execution time when running with both weights could provide more information on this.

**Answer:** We agree with Referee. In that sense, we slightly reformulated the paragraph in order to improve our explanation.