Dear Niels van Berkel and anonymous reviewers,

I hope you are having a great day.

Thank you for allowing us to submit a revision of the manuscript. We appreciate the valuable comments and requests by you and all the reviewers.

We are adding two main revisions to the manuscript based on the feedback from the reviewers.

We have modifed Table 2 and added the extra information requested by the reviewers, and we have performed a very thorough proof-read process of the manuscript to eliminate errors.

All the modified text has been highlighted to ease the revision process.

We are looking forward to the decision about our revised manuscript.

Thank you and best regards,

Mauricio Soto, Chris Satterfield, Thomas Fritz, Gail Murphy, David Shepherd, and Nicholas Kraft
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Dear Mr. Mauricio Soto,

Thank you for submitting your article to the International Journal of Human - Computer Studies. It has now been reviewed and the comments from reviewers are included below. Based on the reviewers' comments and my own reading of your article, minor revisions are needed before it can be published in the journal. I congratulate you on the presented revision, which carefully took into account the issues raised by the reviewers. A few mistakes remain, as suggested by the reviewers - but these should be relatively easy to address.

I'm inviting you to prepare a new version of your article that fully addresses these comments of the reviewers. To accept this invitation, please submit your revised article along with a letter giving a detailed reply to the reviewers' comments within the next 21 days.

Submissions are handled via your account at https://www.editorialmanager.com/ijhcs/. Please look in the "Submissions needing revision" folder for submission IJHCS-D-20-00162R1. You are specifically requested to submit the source files for the revised article (Word, LaTeX); please do not submit a PDF file. Uploading a PDF file at this stage will create delays should your manuscript be accepted for publication. If your revised submission does not include the source files, we will contact you to request them. When revising your manuscript please consult both the journal's guide for authors (https://www.elsevier.com/journals/international-journal-of-human-computer-studies/1071-5819/guide-for-authors), along with information on electronic artwork preparation (http://www.elsevier.com/artworkinstructions). Please also double-check the author names provided in the submission so that authorship related changes are made in the revision stage.

To expedite the review process, your revised article will normally be assessed by an editor of the journal to determine whether the requested revisions have been sufficiently addressed to enable your article to be published.

Thank you once again for your submission to the International Journal of Human - Computer Studies. I look forward to receiving your revised article.

Yours sincerely,

Niels van Berkel

Associate Editor

International Journal of Human - Computer Studies

E-mail address: ijhcs@elsevier.com

Journal website: https://www.editorialmanager.com/ijhcs/

Journal homepage: http://www.elsevier.com/locate/ijhcs

Comments:

Reviewer #1: I would like to thank the authors for their time and efforts in improving the manuscript.

Overall, the manuscript has improved and reviewer comments were very beneficial.

I would recommend this paper for acceptance, however the authors should fix the errors in the manuscript.

Ideally, the authors should perform a very thorough proof-read process to eliminate errors. Some of them are below:

... over longer periods of time time?

To ready the collected data for use in training and testing machine learning models ...

Please make sure that the text is understandable to the reader.

Reviewer #2: Thank you for improving the publication. One more comment:

In the response to Comment 13 (R2) you mention that you added Table 2.

I would suggest also reporting the mixed effects estimates and confidence intervals.

Reviewer #3: I thank the authors for answering mt review comments in details.

In my opinion, the quality of the manuscript has increased significantly and it is suitable for publishing.