Review 1 Comments:

1. The authors present an interesting piece of research relating to fuzzy theory / ANN. The abstract is reasonably well written but could be improved. There is reference to an 'aim' which reads like an overall aim of the research (in progress)- has this aim been achieved in this paper?

[The overall aim of the research is to thoroughly investigate the problem of cost overruns and develop cost models to help in forecasting final cost. An earlier paper, referenced Ahiaga-Dagbui & Smith (2012), used only neural networks to develop cost models. This paper takes that a step further by combining neural networks with fuzzy logic for cost modelling. So yes- much of the initial aim of the research has been achieved so far, although the authors are now exploring more flexible means of modelling cost that can accommodate a continuous stream of data without having to rebuild the models from scratch.]

2. In addition a brief statement at the end on the major consequence of the work, to date? The accuracy of the estimates from the models?

[Not sure what these questions mean]

3. Why the focus on water / infrastructure projects? A brief rationale?
[The research started out to collect data from both building and civil projects- it so occurred that we struggled to acquire data for building projects so just continued on with the data from water infrastructure works. However, the most important lessons learnt in the research, i.e. how to prepare data, develop, validate and update the models are easily transferable to any type of construction project]

4. In the 'model development' section the list of predictors should be given more prominence and explanation that being relegated to a footnote.

[This is an important point. However, its difficult to fit everything into a ten page conference paper. In a journal article based on this paper [under review], the authors have given more details on the predictors used and explained the various options under each of the predictors.]

5. Why Ockham's razor principle test?
[Simplicity is perhaps the first rule of thumb in modelling for several reasons including cost, reliability, easy of deployment and use, resource requirement, etc. It is generally unhelpful to include too many variables in a model as this just increases model complexity and potentially introduces ambiguities and variable redundancies. It is thus always desirable to prune down the number of initial predictors to the minimum without sacrificing model performance. Ockham's razor is only one such methods available]

6. Generally good presentation of the analysis but to assist the reader please try and place tables as close as possible to where they are first referred to in the paper (e.g. tables 4 and 5).

[We've tried to move tables and text around a bit. Thanks]

7. **Review 2 Comments:**
   a) Figure 1: perhaps a line needs to be shown along X-axis, to maintain consistency

b) Tables in general: maintain the consistency of borders, as prescribed by the conference format, See tables 1 & 2.
c) Perhaps a name should be given to the title row of Table 3. Bukky, any thoughts on this?
d) The explanation of he ranges - immediate below the Table 2: "x ≤5.8 Influence is Low" does not make any sense. Would it be 5.4? Correct it accordingly.

All suggestions by reviewer 2 have also been made. Point 4- the low range is 5.4, and not 5.8. Well spotted. Thanks