Response to Review Comments

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We have compiled the review comments and addressed all of the comments in the following list of responses. For each response, we have made related changes in the revised paper. We have provided the revised paper with tracked changes and numbered comments referring to the review comments. The revised and clean version of the paper is also submitted.

We greatly appreciate the review comments and would be glad to discuss any further issues with the editor and the reviewers.

Review Comments:

The paper is useful in facilitating daylighting simulation: the developed prototype realized automatic building data transfer from Revit to Radiance and Daysim and daylighting simulation execution. There are some revisions needed in order to be accepted.

1. The formula used in the prototype to convert the RGB color of the Revit materials into reflectance values should be clarified.

To address this comment, the following equation and description are added to Section X on page Y:

""""""""""""

2. The authors only described the functions of the developed add-in programs, it's not clear to me how they appear in Revit and how to use them. It's beneficial to add a brief explanation or a screenshot of the add-in(s).

The following explanation and screenshots are added for the add-ins in Section X on page Y:

""""""""""

3. The test cases are reasonable, but their validation are not so convincing. It seems to me that only the geometry information is compared before/after transfer from Revit to Radiance, not the material information.

To address this comment, the following description is added to Section X on page Y:

""""""""""
4 The authors should pay more attention to text to make the writing decent, some example are:

4.1. In section 2.1, "which is an annual DC-based daylighting simulation tool with Radiance as it engine"->"as its engine"

4.2. the authors sometimes use "daylighting simulation", sometimes use "daylight simulation", I suggest you make it consistent as daylighting simulation

4.3. In section 2.3.2, "Even though the whole process is automated the geometry for the daylighting simulation is not same as the BIM..."--->"...not the same as ...."

4.4. In section 2.3.2, "This was achieved be developing a custom add-in program that can ..."--"...achieved by developing...."

The authors have made extensive editing to the text in the paper. All the grammar errors mentioned above and other language issues found in the paper during the revision are corrected or improved.