

Please address any issues identified in your reviews in revising your submission. When you are satisfied that your submission is ready, please upload your revised submission to the CCERP submission site by selecting Revise Submission after accessing your submission. Please upload a document of revisions as an additional file, where you address each substantive reviewer comment, and explain what changes (if any) you made to your submission based on the comment. You do not have to follow all reviewers' recommendations, but you must address each one.

Response to Reviewer 3's Notes (Reviewer in main bullet, response in sub-bullet):

- *The article needs to be copy-edited. There are several grammar errors and typos. This is evident in the abstract, which becomes unclear at some places.*
 - You are correct. I have revised the abstract and updated grammar throughout.
- *Usage of APA is not correct for the inline citations, e.g it should be “Finally, GonzálezGranadillo, González-Zarzosa and Diaz (2021) likewise warned against placing unearned trust in air-gaps as the primary defense of SCADA systems” instead of “Finally, González- Granadillo, González-Zarzosa, and Diaz likewise warned against placing unearned trust in air-gaps as the primary defense of SCADA systems. (2021)”.*
 - This was fixed during the conversion to IEEE format.
- *Some of the figures are not easy to understand, due to the lack of colors. In particular, Figure 1 shows two connections of the IDS to the network (I think it should be just one, the monitoring connection). Figure 5 could also benefit from using different colors for the monitoring and normal connections.*
 - I have updated the images with color and higher resolution and have added a legend to Figures 1 and 5.
- *The description of the “Experimental testbed design” could be better done as a table or graphic. The current format (bulleted list) is not clear enough.*
 - I have updated the bulleted list to make it clearer. I have also updated the graphic that goes along with this section and added some text to help clarify
- *Figure captions for figures 2, 3 and 4 are identical. They should be different.*
 - I have no idea how this happened. My apologies. It has been corrected.

Response to Reviewer 5's Notes (Reviewer in main bullet, response in sub-bullet):

- *As there are very few instances of this research it would have been prudent to go into more detail on the previous research and why this experiment was important or different from others.*
 - I feel that the discussion of prior work in the area is clear that the prior papers were about SCADA systems and this paper is about more traditional LANs.
- *In addition, it would have been good to see both the design of the experiment, as well as the results, reviewed by Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to align on the details of the design and output, essentially a validation step. This likely would have added more weight to the experiments results and the next steps or future research needed section.*
 - This is a good idea, but is outside the scope of the original effort. As a revision request it is outside of what is possible during the length of the review period. I feel that my experiment is sufficiently documented that it could be easily replicated and that my results speak for themselves.