

Reply to the review report on

Journal-001: The full title of the submitted paper

by Author A and Author B

December 16, 2024

The authors thank the reviewers for their critical assessment of our work. In the following we address their concerns point by point.

Reviewer 1

Comments to the authors

This is the comments from Reviewer 1. With some more words foo bar foo bar ...

1. Point one
2. Point two

Suggestion: it's better to test a case with ...

Author response

We agree with the reviewer on this point. This is what we did to fix it.

1. Reply one
2. Reply two

$$a^2 + b^2 = c^2. \tag{1}$$

Please see page 5 of the revised version.

Changes

Changes made in the manuscript. Overkill if you also add track changes. To add a track-changes version of the two manuscripts, run `latexdiff` on the original + revised paper. Goolge latexdiff tutorial to see how that works. Once you do that, you can copy-paste code from the file highlighting difference directly in here. For instance:

Our results indicate that increasing ~~decreasing~~ the temperature leads to a significant ~~negligible~~ increase in the growth rate of E. coli ~~bacteria~~.

Reviewer 2

Comment 1

This is Comment 1 from Reviewer 2.

Reply:

This is our reply to Comment 1 from Reviewer 2.

Changes:

Lots of very important changes

Comment 2

This is Comment 2 from Reviewer 2. With some more words foo bar foo bar ...

Reply:

Our reply to it with reference to one of our points above using the L^AT_EX's label/ref system (see also 1).

Changes:

So we did not change absolutely anything on this point.