

Reply to Reviewer #2

We are thankful for the time and efforts spent by the referee on reviewing our manuscript. We agree with all the comments of the referee. All the suggested changes have been duly incorporated in the revised version of the paper. Earlier, we wrote the manuscript in word, we have used latex in the revised version, in order to have better formatting and an overall presentation of the article. Due to change in the source file, page numbers in the revised manuscript have changed for various sections and subsections. However, we have mentioned the new page number against each comment. For the sake of completeness, we produce below all the comments as it is, and the action taken by us.

Suggestions/Corrections:

Comment 1: In this work authors focus on the community detection problem. Their goal is to investigate how the community detection depends on network embedding used. Moreover, they also propose their own community detection algorithm. What I am missing in this work and I would like the Authors to elaborate on that is why you decided to not to include other community detection algorithms for the rest of the study. In Section 4 you demonstrate the performance of your algorithm among other ones for Karate Club. But later on you study it for different settings and do not make any comparison to other methods anymore. What is your justification for that?.

Reply: We have modified the structure of the manuscript in the revised version. Now, there is a separate "related work" and "proposed work" section. Method related to basic voting is presented in "related work"

Comment 2:Cons:

(a) no future work directions (b) I suggest rephrasing "Our study is a remarkable attempt (...)" in Conclusions

Minor comments:

Comment 1: page 5, line 15: space after Newman missing (before the parenthesis)

Comment 2: running title missing (too long)

Comment 3: the acronym for GSA is introduced twice

Comment 4: I believe there is no need to write "Eq. No. X", simple "Eq. X" should be enough (but please verify that)

Comment 5: consider adding a reference to Normalized Mutual Information in Section 5.3

Comment 6: page 15, line 12 - a dot missing in "Eq"

Comment 7: page 17, enumeration of datasets - weird style of enumeration, e.g. here: "Political Blogs (Fig. 3c):- It is a relatively large dataset"

Comment 8: please make the labels and text in figures bigger - some (e.g. in Figure 4) are barely visible

Comment 9:the description of Fig. 2 suggests that the whole figure is about political books

Reply: The revised manuscript has been written in latex. All variables are written in math mode. This takes care of your suggestion.