Dear Editors and Reviewers

We always try to address reviewers comments in the best possible way. However in this case it is clear that the first reviewer accidentally provided the review of another paper. It is clear that there was an error as our paper doesn't discuss anything about respiratory effects, doesn't exhibit the issues mentioned below (eg units) and the excerpts mentioned cannot be found in our manuscript.

We have taken on board all the comments of Reviewer #2 whom we thank for the positive feedback provided.

Reviewer#2
It is interesting to see vehicle 3 has given contradictory results in the both tests. Please justify. A clear explanation is missing in the paper.
Please take care of grammatical mistakes and typo errors in the entire paper

- ➔ *We have proof read the entire manuscript and made a series of corrections and changes that improved the paper.*

Reviewer #1
Authors should consider the user/driver/commuter perspective, routing alone is not enough as it will lead to sub-optimal solution. Literature has shown that. There is a lot of literature on multi-criteria or multi-objective routing. Look under the domain of network modeling, or design or vehicle routing. Some good literature was missed during the course of this research.

Table 1 The units for speed are not veh/hr but km/hr, similarly traffic volume is in vehicle per hour, geometric length should be in Km.

I have fundamental issues with this paper, part of it may stem from lack of proper literature review done by researchers. For instance

Page 6 Statement "Although it seems more accurate to analyze all the possible event combinations for each road link in
nature, however, this study assumes no interactions of the aforementioned events."

This is fundamentally wrong as these events interact with each other, crashes interacts with congestion which results in higher emissions. As far as i understand the interaction of these objectives need to be studied and incorporated to do a good routing. If not for each road link, consider K-shortest paths/routes.

Page 6, second paragraph, How do you calculate outcome of CO2 emission on health respiratory problems. This is not as simple and anybody with background in this area may agree.

Paragaph 3 Page 6 "Usually, the consequences are
calculated from prior studies of similar events but in this case these numbers were logically assumed due to the nonavailability of prior data of risk consequences on the study area"

This is not a research-based statement, it is more of speculation, using logically word does not make it more truthful.

Some example of research papers that should be studied are by W Y Szeto et. al. on multiobjective or sustainable routing; S. Sharma et. al (2009-2015), Wismans, L. J. J., (2011-2018) and references within those works demonstrate that how this problem is not a planner only issue but user/commuter response needs to be considered while planning.