This letter outlines the revisions made in response to the valuable and constructive feedback for the paper titled “Detecting Mild Cognitive Impairment Through Digitized Trail-Making Test Interface” provided by the peer reviewers of the Graphics Interface conference. The changes below have been listed in no particular order:

1. Integrated suggested citations for the five relevant papers provided
    a. *Smith et al. 2016, Smith et al. 2017, Brehmner et al. 2012, Lara-Garduno et al. 2019, Prange et al. 2021*
2. Completed a proofreading pass across paper
3. Provided discussion in Section 6.3.1 regarding what HCI researchers can take away from the research and how it is relevant to the field.
4. Clarified in Section 3 that recorded digital sketches are stored as time-series data and can be replayed for qualitative analysis by the proctor.
5. We agree with the exciting opportunities for further features added through eye-tracking and wearable technology, and acknowledge this potential in Section 7
6. The caption in Table 3 now explains difference between the features “steering” and “FittsSteering”
7. Clarified in Section 5.3.2 the ambiguity between the use of Fitts’ Law Index of Performance vs. Index of Difficulty
8. Corrected the error in Section 6.1 explaining “seven” classification models even though we compared eight classification models. We included Majority classifier as a baseline and left it out of our count.
9. We acknowledge that “hover” in digital sketching refers to a stylus hovering above the tablet. Changed our verbiage on all uses of the word “hover” to “meander”, which more accurately describes participant behavior.
10. Clarified in Section 5.1 that participants completed both sets of tests several hours apart to reduce cognitive load between the two tests
11. Clarified in Section 5.1 that the MoCA scores have an absolute min of 0 and an absolute max of 30
12. Further explained the results outlined in the table describing MAE and RSME (now Table 5) on Section 6.3.2
13. Clarified in Section 5.2 that we observed no participant issues with respect to completing the TMT due to physical limitations to their movement. We’d also like to point out in Section 5.1 that our exclusion criteria accounts for several types of confounders to account for possible biases in the dataset.
14. We agree with the ambiguity of the verbiage describing users, and we clarify in Section 3 that there are two types of end users, “proctor” and “participant”. Through the rest of the paper we replace instances of the generic word “user” with either of the two defined end users for clarity.
15. Explained in Section 5 the origin of constants c=40 and speed threshold 0.4
16. Surfaced the research ties to field of HCI in Section 1.
17. Clarified in the Abstract and Section 1 that we refer to the United States CDC for prevalence of Alzheimer’s disease
18. Clarified confidence interval reporting in Table 1