

Responses to Reviewers' Comments for Manuscript TNNLS-2024-S-XXXX

Yor Title

Addressed Comments for Publication to
IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems
by
FirstAuthors (Institution1; FirstAuthors@126.com)
SecondAuthors (Institution2; SecondAuthors@126.com)

Contents

Preface	0
Response to Editor	1
Response to Associate Editor	2
Response to Reviewer 1	4

Dear Editors, Associate Editor and Reviewers:

Thank you for your valuable and insightful feedback on our manuscript, "XXX." We greatly appreciate your time spent reviewing our manuscript and making constructive suggestions, which have greatly improved the quality of our manuscript. In light of the reviewers' comments and recommendations, we have meticulously revised the manuscript and provided a detailed point-by-point response. Furthermore, we have meticulously reviewed and corrected the manuscript to ensure no errors. We hope that our revisions and responses will meet with your satisfaction.

We want to take this opportunity to thank you for handling our manuscript, and we look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,
Authors

Note: To enhance the legibility of this response letter, all the editor's and reviewers' comments are typeset in boxes. **In the revised manuscript, modified parts are marked in red, and newly added parts are marked in blue.**

Response to Editor

Summary Comment

In view of the reviews and recommendations of the Associate Editor, you may revise your manuscript thoroughly to address the issues raised by the reviewers/Associate Editor and resubmit the revised version (if you wish). Please complete the submission within two months, and include the specific responses to the reviewers and the previous paper ID.

Response:

Thank you for taking the valuable time to work on our manuscript. We also thank you for your constructive suggestions and acknowledgment of our manuscript. According to your request, we read the reviewer's responses in detail, carefully responded to their comments point by point, and revised the original manuscript. With the help of the reviewers' constructive comments, we have added and revised some content to make the article more rigorous and easier to read for wider readers. Thank you again and the reviewers for your careful guidance.

Response to Associate Editor

Summary Comment

The paper presents an interesting and relevant survey, and it has received good reviews. However, I see important deficiencies in the presentation and clarity of the work, and also some missing experiments. All of them should be considered when preparing a new revised version of the manuscript.

Response:

We would like to extend my sincere gratitude for your thorough review and valuable feedback on our manuscript. We appreciate the time and effort you have invested in evaluating our work and fully acknowledge the deficiencies you have identified in the presentation and clarity of our study, as well as the missing experiments.

We understand the importance of addressing these issues to enhance the quality and impact of our research. Below, we outline the steps to address each of your concerns.

Comment 1 of Associate Editor

- The authors should perform some experiments to provide better guidelines and insights to the readership.

Response:

Thank you very much for your valuable comments and suggestions. Our initial manuscript included no experiments because we followed other high-quality surveys [1]–[5] that did not include experiments. However, in light of your valuable feedback, we conducted some necessary experiments to provide better guidelines and insights to the readership. In the revised manuscript, we added a new section (Section VII on the 17th page of the revised manuscript) dedicated to comparative experiments, and we anonymously open-sourced the code implementing all experiments. For your convenience, we have restated the experimental part of the revised manuscript below.

References

- [1] Z. Wu, S. Pan, F. Chen, G. Long, C. Zhang, and S. Y. Philip, "A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 4–24, 2020.
- [2] S. Ji, S. Pan, E. Cambria, P. Marttinen, and S. Y. Philip, "A survey on knowledge graphs: Representation, acquisition, and applications," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 33, no. 2, pp. 494–514, 2021.
- [3] Z. Li, F. Liu, W. Yang, S. Peng, and J. Zhou, "A survey of convolutional neural networks: Analysis, applications, and prospects," *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, vol. 33, no. 12, pp. 6999–7019, 2021.
- [4] X.-Y. Zhang, G.-S. Xie, X. Li, T. Mei, and C.-L. Liu, "A survey on learning to reject," *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 111, no. 2, pp. 185–215, 2023.
- [5] C. Li, C. Guo, L. Han, *et al.*, "Low-light image and video enhancement using deep learning: A survey," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, vol. 44, no. 12, pp. 9396–9416, 2021.

Response to Reviewer 1

Summary Comment

The paper offers an extensive overview of the latest confidence calibration techniques for deep imbalanced learning, presenting significant and relevant research. However, there are a few areas where improvement could be made.

Response:

We would like to express our sincere gratitude for your feedback and valuable suggestions on our manuscript. We have carefully considered each of your points and revised them carefully.

Comment 1.1

- A summary of the practical domains where these methods have been applied, or could be applied, is missing.

Response 1.1:

Thank you for the pertinent suggestions. We agree with your point of view. We added an application section (Section VIII) on the 18th page of the revised manuscript. For your convenience, we put the newly added application section below, and we hope it will satisfy you.

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Listing 1: Algorithm

```
for i in range(1, N+1):  
    # Run  
    perform_operation(i)
```

Nam dui ligula, fringilla a, euismod sodales, sollicitudin vel, wisi. Morbi auctor lorem non justo. Nam lacus libero, pretium at, lobortis vitae, ultricies et, tellus. Donec aliquet, tortor sed accumsan bibendum, erat ligula aliquet magna, vitae ornare odio metus a mi. Morbi ac orci et nisl hendrerit mollis. Suspendisse ut massa. Cras nec ante. Pellentesque a nulla. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Aliquam tincidunt urna. Nulla ullamcorper vestibulum turpis. Pellentesque cursus luctus mauris.



Figure 1: IU

The table is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The criteria for including methods.

Type	Description
Direct solution	Aiming to solve the target problem.
Indirect solution	No aiming to solve other problems; Empirical validation of solving target problem.