

Reply to the review report on

Journal-001: The full title of the submitted paper

by Author A and Author B

April 3, 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 comments of 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 line 10 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. Google `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 of Reviewer 2.

Reply:

Our reply to This is comment 1 of Reviewer 2.

Changes:

Lots of very important changes

Comment 2

This is comment 2 of 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 \LaTeX 's label/ref system (see also 1).

Changes:

So we did not change absolutely anything on this point.