

Thank you for your support and as you stated in your letter that our paper's manuscript number: 2013/BJAST/3277 needs to be checked carefully to prevent any grammatical or syntax errors, and badly constructed sentences and some other corrections pointed out by the reviewers. However, a modified (revised) form based on the reviewers' comments is made, where all the comments are considered as follows:

1. Language Barrier

(A) Checking the manuscript to prevent any grammatical or syntax errors, and badly constructed sentences. **The corrections have been done all over the entire manuscript**

(B) “First, the literature review part doesn’t focus on the subject of this paper. Second, neither analysis nor comparison of literature can be found to introduce the subject. What is worse, the 1-7 paragraphs are nearly completely copied from the abstracts of the reference. ”The literature review of the revised version is still poorly written. Re-write the literature review using their own words, based on their understanding. **The manuscript has been re-written and modified (see Pages 2 and 3**

2. Technical Questions

(A) A well written motivation of research is usually needed for a good paper. Unfortunately, I cannot find it in this manuscript. In the introduction part, the authors should articulate what the unsolved problem is and briefly highlight their contribution. How do their results differ from the published ones? What can people achieve from their results compared with other published ones? **The manuscript has been re-written and modified (See Pages 2 and 3.**

(B) Nomenclature doesn’t include all the parameters used in this manuscript. **The nomenclature now includes all the parameters used in this manuscript (See Pages 1 and 2.**

(C) On page 4, the authors mentioned: “The radiation efficiency (σ) which is presented in equation (4) can be established for the surface of a gearbox structure by idealizing the structure as an assembly of simple flat plates (panels) as shown in Fig. 1.”

In addition to schematic diagram of figure1, the authors may show a photo of the practical gearbox surface to validate their assumption that the surface can be assembled by several flat plates. **A photograph has been added (See Page 7, Fig. 2).**

(D) On page 6 under “Test Procedure”, the authors should list the types of the accelerometers applied to the experiments. Do they affect the system’s vibration response? **The type of accelerometers is added with their some specifications to show that the accelerometers don’t affect their readings (See Page 7, section 3.2).**

(E) Figure2 is not acceptable, words should be legible. **The figure has been replaced by the original figure (See Page 9, Fig. 3).**

(F) I do not know what conclusion the authors are trying to make in the last paragraph on page 8. Is it possible that the larger transient vibration magnitude is triggered by initial conditions? The authors should give more explanation. **More explanations, discussions and modifications have been made (See Page 10, paragraph 2).**

(G) The authors should interpret what “the same trend” means in the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 9 “Generally speaking, the spectra exhibit the same trend with different peaks and different locations”. **The discussion has been corrected and presented in Page 10, last paragraph.**

(H) Since the values of the parameters are scattered everywhere, readers might have hard time to follow. The authors should list tables to include **complete** parameter values for repeat in gand checking. For instance, the authors described how to calculate the gear mesh frequency in the last paragraph on page 9, but did not give the number of the teeth of the gearing system. Furthermore, they did NOT even depict the structure of the gearbox (fixed-axis gear or planetary gear or the combination). Without complete information, there is no way to check the results of this manuscript. **Tables No. 1 and 2 have already presented in Page 6 and the number of teeth of the input gear in the second shift has also been added in Page 10, second paragraph.**

(I) The English writing of the first paragraph on page11 is unacceptable and must be modified. Note: “Figure 6.15” does not exist. **Corrections have been made and presented in Page 13, last paragraph.**

(J) The paragraph on page 12 is very ambiguous to me and must be revised. For instance, where is the “0.6m noise source” located in the gearbox? The authors should articulate clearly the meaning of “the same trend”, when they state “Generally speaking, the spectra exhibit the same trend with different peaks and different locations. A common peak exists at 1/3-octave band of 50 Hz, while the level is different due to the element location in the idealization, its area and its end conditions.” I could NOT see “the same trend” and the common peak at 50Hz from figure 16-19. Please explain. What conclusions are the authors trying to make from this paragraph? **Corrections have been made and presented in Page 14, last paragraph.**

(K) Boundary conditions are critical and important for plate theoretical modeling. Please list a table showing the boundary conditions used in this manuscript, if any. **Table No. 3 has been added and presented in Page 8.**

We hope that all the reviewers comments are correctly covered and the paper in its modified (revised) form can be accepted. We look forward to hear from you about the final decision.