Dear Editor,

We would like to express our sincere gratitude for your invaluable guidance on our manuscript titled "Consistency ordinary differential equations network for person re-identification" (Manuscript ID: 241131G). Your insightful comments have played a crucial role in enhancing the overall quality of our work. Enclosed herewith are our meticulous point-by-point responses to your constructive suggestions.

Throughout the revised manuscript, modifications have been highlighted in yellow for easy identification. We believe that these revisions, along with our detailed responses, effectively address the concerns raised during the review process. Our earnest endeavor has been to align the manuscript with the standards expected for publication in the Journal of Electronic Imaging (JEI).

We extend our sincere appreciation for the diligent efforts of the editors in critically evaluating our work. We are hopeful that the thorough corrections made will meet with your approval. Once again, we thank you for your thoughtful comments and invaluable suggestions.

Sincerely,

Jieyu Ding

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

Responses to the comments of Reviewer #1:

1. In Eq. (7) on page 10, the symbol \mathcal{L}\_{\text{s}} should be consistently represented as \mathcal{L}\_{\text{con}}.

Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have revised Eq. (7) on page 10, changing the symbol\mathcal{L}\_{\text{s}} to \mathcal{L}\_{\text{con}} to ensure consistency in the notation throughout the manuscript. We appreciate your attention to detail.

1. In Eq. (9) on page 11, the symbol \epsilon should be consistently represented as \epsilon\_{y}.

Response: Thank you for your insightful comment. We have updated Eq. (9) on page 11, replacing the symbol \epsilon with \epsilon\_{y} to maintain consistency in notation throughout the text. We appreciate your careful review.

1. The data preprocessing section on page 13 only mentions scaling in the implementation details. If there are additional preprocessing techniques utilized, it would be beneficial to include them for clarity and completeness.

Response: Thank you for your valuable comment. We have revised the manuscript on page 13 to provide a more comprehensive description of the preprocessing techniques used. In addition to scaling, we applied several data augmentation strategies to enhance the diversity of the training data, including random horizontal flipping, random cropping, padding, and random erasing.

Responses to the comments of Reviewer #2:

1. The incorporation of ordinary differential equations (ODEs) into the person re-identification task is an interesting approach. However, the "Schematic illustration of CODEN" (Figure 1) is not effective in facilitating readers' comprehension of this paper.

Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have revised Figure 1 on page 7 to improve its effectiveness. Specifically, we adjusted the flow of the schematic diagram and added more detailed annotations. These changes are aimed at better highlighting the key components of the method and improving clarity for the readers. If you feel further modifications are needed, please don't hesitate to let us know.

1. The writing of this paper requires refinement. Some sentences, such as "Specifically, CODEN models...... by non-target pedestrians" and "We introduce a consistency...... to distinguish individuals", are difficult to understand.

Response: Thank you for your constructive feedback. To improve readability and clarity, we have revised the sentences on pages 2 and 3 by adjusting the sentence structure and simplifying the phrasing. We believe these changes enhance the overall clarity of the text. Thank you again for highlighting this issue, and we hope the revisions make the paper easier to understand.

1. The experimental design in this paper is comprehensive and meticulous.

Response: Thank you for your positive feedback regarding the experimental design. We are delighted that you found our approach comprehensive and meticulous. Your comments encourage us to continue pursuing rigorous and thoughtful methodologies.

1. Section 2 (Related work) ought to center on the most recent research in the ReID field.

Response: Thank you for your valuable feedback. We have revised Section 2 (Related work) on pages 3, 4, and 5 to incorporate recent advancements in the ReID field. Specifically, we condensed the discussion of older methods and incorporated new research papers. We truly appreciate your insightful suggestion.