Dear Editor and Reviewers,

RE: TPAMI-2014-07-0536.R1, "Transductive Multi-view Zero-Shot Learning" by Yanwei Fu, Timothy M. Hospedales, Tao Xiang and Shaogang Gong

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions. We have revised our manuscript in line with the comments and suggestions. Details of our changes to the manuscript and our responses (in italics) are elaborated below. We hope that our revised manuscript is acceptable for publication in IEEE TPAMI.

Response to Editor

1. The reviewers were overall satisfied with the revised manuscript. However, Reviewer 1 identifies some mistakes and unclear statements, and Reviewer 2 requested some further changes that should be addressed in a further, minor, revision. Reviewer 2 also raises a valid point by mentioning that the author response contains a lot of information that is helpful for the understanding of the manuscript. I would encourage the authors to make an effort to include the most important points of this information into the main manuscript, e.g. by shortening parts of the introduction.

   We have corrected all the minor errors pointed out by the reviewers. We have also clarified all the unclear statements highlighted by the reviewers, which was very helpful in improving the clarity and readability of the paper. As suggested by Reviewer 2, we have further selected two most insightful experiments from the Round 1 response letter and added them into the revised manuscript (see Section 6.2.2 and Figure 4). To conform to the the page limit, The Introduction and Related Work sections have been shortened. Other important information from the Round 1 response letter will be put on a project webpage for this work.

   More detailed response to the reviewers' comments can be found below.

Response to Reviewer 2

1. The current structure of the experiments seem to focus more on comparison to other methods than in explaining/understanding the proposed method. I would suggest to turn this around and to include a most of the insightful experiments given in the response letter. To obtain the additional required space, the introduction (now over 2 pages) could be trimmed.

   Thanks for your suggestion. We have selected two experiments from the response letter, which we consider to be the most insightful, and included them in the revised manuscript (see Section 6.2.2 and Figure 4). The first experiment compares the soft-weighting CCA used in our approach to the conventional hard-weighting CCA. The second experiment shows that both the CCA embedding and the label propagation components of the proposed approach contribute to its strong performance. The Introduction and Related Work sections are trimmed to make space required for the new experiments. In addition, we will put the rest of the insightful experiments on a project webpage.

2. I find it strange that 16 is referred to in the introduction, and then out-of-the-blue comes back a few times. The current manuscript requires a good understanding of 16 to be able to see the differences and get a few important parts of this manuscript. It would be extremely helpful if the important parts of 16 can be included (eg section 5 and 6.3 seem an identical copy), then also include the main methods).

   We have revised the manuscript so that [16] (now [14]) is not referred in Introduction to avoid confusion. In the Related Work section, we emphasise the main difference between [16] and this work, that is, the use of heterogeneous hypergraphs in the place of homogeneous 2-graphs (see the last paragraph of Section 2). There are many other significant differences, in terms of experimental additions and presentation improvements (please see the Statement of Differences document submitted in Round 1). But due to the space constraint, they cannot be discussed in details in the manuscript.