Response to reviewer 1:

1. Among the issues that caught my attention in the article is the fact that the author draws attention that a major limitation in manufacturing is the fact that work cells do not adapt even to small changes in the production environment and need to be reprogrammed offline. However, no reference is given for this assertion,

A reference is provided for the fact that 95% of industrial robots lack sensing in their outer feedback loop. A statement that clarifies why lack of sensing leads to lack of flexibility to change has been added.

1. nor the presented example explicitly contemplates the case where late binding of part locations  proposals could be applied to a real situation of environment change and reprogramming

Additional text has been included in section 3.1 to address this. This augments the text that already presented an example in section 3.2.

1. In my opinion it is not clearly described the extensions that has been performed in order to remove the need to program the robot for new predicates and actions.

I am not sure that I follow this comment. The entirety of section 4 (and section 4.4 in particular) describes additions to the ontology that encode predicates and actions as compositions of basic functions that make up a basis set of robotic vision and action primitives. This decomposition and representation in the ontology is the heart of this paper.

1. Another problem I encounter in the article is that it is very focused on itself. In the introduction the author does not enumerate or analyze other proposals that might exist and that could allow greater flexibility in the scheduling of work cells.

Additional material is added to the introduction that speaks to several similar projects. This was also used to provide more recent references.

1. I also believe that the bibliography presented is quite limited. Reference [1] is a youtube video, which is quite unusual. Moreover, from the 9 references submitted, 30% are the author's own work and these are the only that is recent (> 2010).

More recent references are now included. I have justified my accuracy claim by a more “reputable” reference and have even added an additional YouTube video. The YouTube videos are in place to show that the vendors’ claims of accuracy can be easily replicated by many different individuals.

Response to reviewer 2:

HIGHLIGHTS - A domain is not listed with which this research is being conducted. From the title and paper details, it appears that the domain is manufacturing. This should be explicitly clear in the highlights.

Not sure that I understand “highlights”. Manufacturing is one of the keywords.  
  
PUNCTUATION - There are several instances throughout the document where punctuation is lacking (e.g. Line 3 - use a comma after 'However')

Fixed line 3. More specific instances would help to fix any other locations.  
  
GRAMMAR  
There are numerous uses of the phrases 'be able to' and 'in order to.' In most instances, these can be removed.

Only one instance of “be able to”, this was removed. Removed 4 of 5 occurrences of “in order to”.

Likewise, a sentence should never end with a prepositional phrase (e.g. Line 5)

Line 5 was fixed. More specific instances would help to fix any other locations.  
Line 227 (working backwards from 230 on page 15) - Is 'lass' supposed to be 'class?'

Yes, this has been fixed.  
  
ADD TECHNICAL CLARITY  
Line 7 - What is an 'outer feedback loop.' This should either be defined or referenced.  
Line 343-344 - Please elaborate on the statement of 'This work has been performed in simulation.' What were the findings? Will the simulation be used in further efforts? What did you learn from the simulation exercise?

The simulation framework was elaborated upon. Simple findings are listed, but detailed findings are beyond the scope of this paper.  
Overall - This work appears to hold much promise, yet greater clarity could be provided to the manufacturing example to make it easier for the reader to understand the approach.

Various text has been added in order to attempt to clarify the manuscript.   
  
ADD REFERENCES  
Line 11 - A statement is made about just-in-time manufacturing and small batch processing that should be supported with at least 1 reference

By definition, a small batch is a limited quantity of a particular product. By observation, changing to a different product would require different robot programming. I am not able to locate a reference that proves this statement. If one is available, I would be happy to add it.  
Line 20 - An IEEE WG is noting as taking the first steps to create a knowledge repository. At minimum, a website should be referenced indicating the specifics of these first steps and their overall plans.

Added reference.  
Line 24-25 - An industrial subgroup is mentioned to have applied the infrastructure to a sample kit building system. This application, including any findings, should be referenced.  
Overall - The paper only lists 9 references…that seems a bit light.

Several additional references have been added.  
  
FIGURE REVISIONS  
Figure 7 - 'place-kitTray' appears redundant…it shows up twice.

Fixed  
Figure 8 - Recommend presenting this code in Pseudo-code. It would make the this code much easier to understand and follow

This is standard PDDL representation and would lose meaning if presented in pseudo-code.