

Revision Letter

Submission to VENUE 202X

We have previously submitted an earlier version of this paper to VENUE. Based on the reviewer's comments we created a major revision of the paper.

Overall, the reviewers agreed that the idea was good but identified a number of weaknesses. We addressed these issues, as well as the other points raised by the reviewers in this submission. Most importantly, we completely restructured our idea. We now do something specific.

Below, we provide the full reviews for our submission to VENUE and interleave them with

point-by-point comments,

(optional) as well as a difference-view of the revised paper indicating all changes to the original version.

1 Summaries of Reviewer Concerns and Our Revisions

Issue 1 Lacking justification for everything (R1, R2, R3, R4).

Response 1. We justified all the stuff now.

Issue 2 The proposed method should have been better (R1, R2).

Response 2. The reviews should have been better. Also, see Resp. 1 as well as Resps. 3 and 4.

2 Summaries of Individual Reviews

2.1 Reviewer 1

Primary, Score: 2, Reject

Pros:

- The general idea seems useful

Cons:

- Mathematical notation is confusing and sometimes lacking

2.2 Reviewer 2

Secondary, Score: 2, Reject

Pros:

- Interesting idea and useful method

Cons:

- The idea is not new

3 VENUE 202X Reviews and Responses

3.1 The Summary Review

Overall, the reviewers considered many things.

Summary Rating

Reject

The paper is not ready for publication ever.

The work may have some value but the paper is just bad.

3.2 Reviewer 1

This paper presents a method.

Strengths:

S1: Useful

S2: Useful

S3: Useful

The source code is included and available on GitHub.

Weaknesses:

The mathematical notation is lacking in precision, correctness and consistency.

W1: Bad

W2: Bad

W3: Bad

Response 3. We revised our mathematical notation by making it precise, correct and consistent.

Detailed remarks:

In section 3.2 the spellings colors, colours and coulors appear.

Response 4. Typos have been corrected.

Overall Rating

2 - Reject

The paper is not ready for publication.

Justification Bla bla.

Expertise Knowledgeable

Confidence Very confident

Supplemental Materials Acceptable

3.3 Reviewer 2

The overall idea of this work is not new.

Response 5. This comment seems to stem from unclear phrasing in our related work section which we revised by clearly pointing out how our contribution adds to and differs from previous work.

In addition, the work lacks a thorough evaluation.

Overall Rating

2 - Reject

The paper is not ready for publication

Justification Bla bla.

Expertise Expert

Confidence Very confident

Supplemental Materials Acceptable with minor revisions