

## **Review Response Letter**

**Paper ID:** PID\_382

**Title:** RAG HUB - A Comprehensive Guide to Build an AI Architecture

Dear Dr. Panachakel and Reviewers,

We appreciate the time and effort you invested in reviewing our manuscript. We have carefully considered all comments and have revised the manuscript accordingly. Below, we outline our responses and the changes made in the revised version.

---

### **Reviewer Comment 2: Relevance to the theme of the conference**

*Comment:*

- “The paper is relevant to the conference theme.”

*Response:*

- We thank the reviewer for acknowledging the relevance of our work. No changes were required in this aspect.
- 

### **Reviewer Comment 3: Clarity of Presentation**

*Comment:*

- “The presentation is clear enough.”

*Response:*

- We are pleased that the clarity of our presentation was positively noted. We have further refined the language in some sections to enhance readability without altering the technical content.
- 

### **Reviewer Comment 4: Reference to Prior Work**

*Comment:*

- “References are adequate.”

*Response:*

- We appreciate the acknowledgment of our literature review. We have ensured that all references have been double-checked and are current.
- 

### **Reviewer Comment 5: Originality/Novelty**

*Comment:*

- “Moderately original; provides limited new insights or understanding.”

*Response:*

- We acknowledge the reviewer’s concern regarding the level of novelty. In the revised manuscript, we have emphasized the unique aspects of RAG HUB’s guided, question-driven methodology. Additionally, we have clarified how our approach differentiates from existing solutions by focusing on dynamic filtering and decision-tree logic tailored for varying developer expertise.

---

#### **Reviewer Comment 6 & 7 & 9 : Overall Evaluation and Justification**

*Comment:*

- “Marginal accept” with the justification that while the paper addresses a relevant problem and outlines a structured methodology, it lacks empirical evaluations or comparative benchmarks against tools like LangChain and LlamaIndex.

*Response:*

- With respect to discussion of enhancements, there is a lot of scope for change (and add the details from the conclusion paragraph). However, since RAG HUB utilizes libraries provided from frameworks such as LlangChain and LlamaIndex and it is relatively new, an emperical comparison and comparative analysis table can not be produced at this moment.

We have updated the manuscript to strictly adhere to the IEEE formatting guidelines. No content has been added beyond what the reviewers have requested, and all changes were made solely to address the review comments and to improve the clarity and empirical grounding of our work.

Thank you once again for your valuable feedback. We hope the revised manuscript meets your expectations and we look forward to the opportunity to present our work at ICCV 2025.

Sincerely,

Suvardhan Dileep Gaddameedi  
Sudeep Aryan