**Response to the Suggestions and Comments on**

**Manuscript Title: Optimal Placement of FACTS Controllers for Congestion Management in the Deregulated Power System**

**General Reply:**

First of all author is grateful to the Editor and Review Experts for their interest in the paper and valuable comments. Author has now come out with a new version of the paper after accommodating the Reviewer’s suggestions. All the changes to the manuscript are highlighted using ***red colored text***. Responses to Reviewer’s comments are summarized next:

**Response to Editor’s Comments:**

**Comment: We have reached a decision regarding your submission to International Journal of Electrical and Computer Engineering (IJECE), "Optimal Placement of FACTS Controllers for Congestion Management in the Deregulated Power System".**

**Our decision is to: REVISIONS required.**

**Response:** Author would like to thank the Editor-in-Chief for giving an opportunity to incorporate the suggestions given by the Reviewers, thereby improving the quality of the manuscript. All the suggestions of the Reviewers are suitably incorporated in the revised manuscript. All the changes to the manuscript are highlighted using ***red colored text***. A detailed response to the Reviewers’ comments is provided.

**Response to Reviewers’ Comments:**

**Reviewer D:**

Author would like to thank the Reviewer for excellent review and nice suggestions made to improve the quality of the paper. The valuable suggestions and corrections are incorporated cautiously in the revised manuscript. The following are the response to the suggestions of Reviewer:

**1Q).  Some detailed analysis and explanation about the proposed method are  
needed for a revised version.**

**Response:** Author would like to thanks the Reviewer for this comment. As suggested by the Reviewer, a detailed analysis and explanation about the proposed approach has been presented in the revised manuscript (in Page Numbers 2, 5 and 6).

**2Q).  English language needs a revising before publication.**

**Response:** As suggested by the Reviewer, author has made a sincere attempt to improve the English language of the entire manuscript. Author has proofread the entire paper carefully by correcting the typographical errors and mistakes in grammar, style and spelling.

**3Q). The method that the author has proposed is not compared with other  
approaches to clearly demonstrate the readability of work.**

**Response:** Author thanks the Reviewer for the valuable comment. As suggested by the Reviewer, the results obtained with the proposed approaches have been compared with other techniques presented in the literature. This has been presented in the revised manuscript (in Page Numbers 8 and 9).

Thank you so much for the good suggestions and thorough reviewing of the paper.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Reviewer E:**

Author would like to thank the Reviewer for excellent review of the paper, nice suggestions and encouraging comments made to improve the quality of the paper. The following are the response to the suggestions of the Reviewer:

**1Q). The language of the manuscript is not well-written and the way of presenting the paper is not appropriate. The text should be seriously revised.**

**Response:** As suggested by the Reviewer, author has made a sincere attempt to improve the English language of the entire manuscript. Author has proofread the entire paper carefully by correcting the typographical errors and mistakes in grammar, style and spelling.

**2Q). The proposed work does not offer significant innovations and the contribution of this work is limited.**

**Response:** The motivation for this work and the major contributions are presented in the revised manuscript (in Page No. 2, last paragraph).

**3Q). Some acronyms are given without proper definitions.**

**Response:** As suggested by the Reviewer, all the acronyms are defined properly in the revised manuscript.

**4Q). The proposed work determines the location for the placement of FACTS devices but no work has been done for the congestion management problem.**

**Response:** The objective of the paper is to determine the optimal location of FACTS controllers for solving the congestion management problem. In the revised manuscript, author has presented the objectives congestion management in Page No. 5 and simulation results in Page Numbers 8 and 9.

**5Q).  The objective function of the proposed work needs to be stated clearly.**

**Response:** As suggested by the Reviewer, the objective functions considered in this paper have been presented in the revised manuscript in Section 3 (in Page No. 5).

**6Q). Optimization algorithm must be used for the optimal sizing of FACTS devices and other controlling parameters.**

**Response:** Author thanks the Reviewer for the valuable comment. The optimization algorithm used for optimal sizing and to control the parameters of TCSC and TCPAR have been presented in the revised manuscript in Section 3.5 (in Page Numbers 5 and 6).

**7Q). Why the proposed method is used to find the optimal location of FACTS devices is not shown in paper. What are the advantages of this method should be shown in this paper.**

**Response:** The advantages of proposed approach over the various approaches presented in the literature has been presented in the revised manuscript.

Thank you so much for good suggestions and thorough reviewing of the paper.

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Overall, author appreciates the comments and suggestions made by the Editor and Reviewers, which has helped to improve the quality of the paper.

Thank you.

Submitted by,

Surender Reddy Salkuti.