**Response to criticisms**

* Needs a user study.
  + Restructured to include details of a study carried out on the implementation of the technique.
* Lack of clear technical contribution.
  + Made it clearer that the technique itself is the contribution should form part of the intro and conclusion.
* The six Display Shape Dependence Issues are obtained from straightforward observation, and the classification is not very reasonable.  
  It is better that these terms are computable and give some metrics at the same time. For example, the overlapping term can be calculated by intersection/union. For scaling term, how to quantify the extremeness?
  + Added metrics to the study based on the following units of measurements (i) % Change in items' visibility, (ii) Change in layout scale and (iii) Total distance items are moved by the pull technique (relative to the layout scale).
* The assumption should be clarified at first.  
  I guess there is only linear transformations of the items.
  + Made it clear that the technique presented is for 2D displays and allows for interventions at different points in the technique depending on the content. Also explained that the additional control given to developers is important, linear transformations makes this possible whereas more complex transformations would make similar interventions much trickier to implement.
* How does the algorithm relate to the proposed issues?  
  Why it can minimise those issues? The author only describe the algorithm, but have not proven that it is an optimal solution for minimizing the issues.
  + The study outlines the relation between the issues and metrics.
* Define an energy based on the 6 issues and optimize the energy to get the final result.
  + The addition of metrics to the study should resolve this.
* Contribution of this paper is not clear, and authors should clearly point it out in the end of introduction part.
  + The intro was made more concise and clearer in stating the contribution of the paper (the technique).
* This paper is not well organized, and it is not easy for me to understand the main idea.
  + A more concise intro has been made and the paper now conforms to a more typical study then results structure.
* The exposition of the paper is not very good.
  + The intro has been made to detail that the paper delivers a technique and evaluates it with a study.
* The paper is too long
  + Shortened the longer sections by removing all repetition of information stated elsewhere. Focussed the study on just the 2 more interesting use-cases.
* Propose some principle and method for good layout of shape, which can be expressed by energy function.
  + The addition of metrics to the user study should resolve this.
* It is not easy to understand the idea of the paper, therefore not easy to implement.
  + The more concise intro and paper restructure should help with making the concepts discussed in the paper easier to understand. The study should make it easier to re-create the implementation.
* The equations and mathematical symbols in this paper is very little, and the paper fails to give some technical details.
  + The only element of the paper which was lacking in technical detail was the review of the technique – the addition of metrics to the study should resolve this issue.
* Some of the figures are not clear.
  + Additional comments added to the figures and image resolutions increased.
* The technique part is not enough to be a research paper.
  + Study added.