

Title of the paper

Revision notes

Claudio Di Ciccio^{*1}, Author Ecs², Writer Why³, and Contributor Zed³

¹ Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands

² University of a City, World

³ The City University, World

Dear Editors,

We express our gratitude for the time and effort dedicated to the reviewing of our submitted manuscript. We worked diligently to address all the concerns raised by the referees. Below we provide our detailed response to their comments. We have highlighted the main changes in the paper by colouring the modified text and adding side notes in which the addressed remarks are referenced. We hope that the applied revisions are to the satisfaction of the editors.

With kind regards,

Claudio Di Ciccio, on behalf of the authors

Manuscript information

Number: JRNL_YEAR_NUM

Title: "Title of the paper"

Authors: Claudio Di Ciccio, Author Ecs, Writer Why, Contributor Zed

Revision: 1

Submitted to: Journal of Something

Special issue: SI:CONF20XX

^{*}Corresponding author

✉ Utrecht University, Princetonplein 5, 3584 CC Utrecht, Netherlands

✉ c.diciccio@uu.nl

✉ +12 3 456 7890

Reviewer I

Comment I.1:

This paper talks about something and is very good.

Answer: We thank the Reviewer for the thorough summary of the contents and the appreciation in our work.

Assignment: Claudio

Done

Reviewer II

Comment II.2:

The paper presents a breakthrough approach to tackle an interesting challenge. However, I have not understood what the challenge is.

Answer: We have worked on the paper in order to make the contribution clearer. We hope that the Reviewer is now satisfied by the modifications applied to this revision.

Assignment: Claudio

Done

Comment II.3:

3 The manuscript has a very intriguing title.

Answer: We express our gratitude to the Reviewer for the appreciation in our work.

Assignment: Claudio

Done

References

- [1] Anton Yeshchenko, Claudio Di Ciccio, Jan Mendling, and Artem Polyvyanyy. Visual drift detection for event sequence data of business processes. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics*, 28(8):3050–3068, August 2022. doi: 10.1109/TVCG.2021.3050071.
- [2] Alessio Ceconni, Luca Barbaro, Claudio Di Ciccio, and Arik Senderovich. Measuring rule-based LTLf process specifications: A probabilistic data-driven approach. *Information Systems*, 120:102312, February 2024. ISSN 0306-4379. doi: 10.1016/j.is.2023.102312.
- [3] Davide Basile and Claudio Di Ciccio. Secrecy preservation for online process monitoring with trusted execution environment. In *BPM*, pages 235–254, September 2025. doi: 10.1007/978-3-032-02867-9_15.

How to use the commands of this response letter template

Note: If you wish to remove this instructions page, just turn the `\documentclass` command in `letter.tex` from `\documentclass[9pt,draft]{extarticle}` to `\documentclass[9pt,final]{extarticle}`

Begin a new section for another reviewer with `\ReviewerSection`. This command will print a new unnumbered section's title and advance a special counter named `therewriter`. See below.

Reviewer III

Comment III.4:

Comment of Reviewer III.

Answer:

Reply of the authors. Notice that the Reviewer's number is given by the counter (`therewriter`). The comment's counter increases automatically at every new `\begin{ReviewerComment}... \end{ReviewerComment}`. In the L^AT_EX code of this very part, you might notice that we pass an optional parameter when beginning the `ReviewerComment` environment: `\label{memo:example:comment}`. It is a label to be used later on for references (`ref` and `cref`; see below).

Task assignment and degree of difficulty. Below it, please assign the task to one of the authors, and define one of the following (expected) levels of difficulty. For instance: `\Assignment{?} \NotEstimatedRevTask` for unassigned/not assessed revision tasks, or `\Assignment{Claudio} \MediumRevTask` otherwise. When a revision task is done, you can mark it with "Done": `\RevTaskDone`. When a revision task is work-in-progress, you can mark it with "Work-in-progress": `\WorkInProgressRevTask`. To mark a revision task as almost done, you can use the command `\AlmostDoneRevTask`. All boxes about the difficulty or the status of the revision task will disappear by adding the `final` option to the document.

Highlighted notes. If there are some notes that should be highlighted, say, in the answer to reviewers, please use the commands defined on purpose, like this: `\NoteInEvidence{like this:}`

Note: or like this. `\begin{NoteForAuthors}or like this.\end{NoteForAuthors}`

Both kinds of highlights will be removed as soon as the "draft" option is removed from the document class preamble declaration.

Should you want to emphasise some changes in the manuscript for further check, discussing with the other co-authors, etc., please enclose the text to be highlighted in ...

`\begin{HlRev}[\ref{memo:example:comment}]`
... something like this. The parameter (here `\ref{memo:example:comment}`) is optional. It is put after "Comment" as a side-note. Feel free to pass multiple comma-separated ref's! `\end{HlRev}`

Do you like it? To make it work, make sure to import the `addon/commands-for-revisions.tex` file in your manuscript's main file's preamble, too, and alter the `\externaldocument` command indicating the location of the response letter's file.

References. Please notice that to refer to comments within the document, they first must be labelled with an optional parameter:

`\begin{ReviewerComment}[\label{memo:example:comment}]`

Later on, also the `\cref{memo:example:comment}` command can be used, to automatically obtain: Comment III.4.

To mention sections, figures, etc., please use the `\ref` command as usual: When referring to the manuscript, prepend `paper:` as a prefix before the actual section/figure/etc. label ID. For instance, the "???" of "Section ???"¹ is here generated by this L^AT_EX code: `\ref{paper:sec:introduction}` Please alter the line in `letter.tex` according to the location of the main paper file, so as to let the reference be found:

`\externaldocument[paper:]{../manuscript}`

Bibliographic references are, of course, welcome (e.g., we can mention here a few articles and conference papers whose revisions were accompanied by letters created with this template [1, 2, 3?]). See the lines at the end of the `letter.tex` (main) file.

Other "comment" environments. Notice that there are several environments other than `ReviewerComment` to specify the role of who wrote the review, such as `GuestEditorComment`, `MetaReviewComment`, `EditorComment`, and the others you can find in: `addon/commands-for-letter-to-reviewers.tex`. It is advisable not to introduce those with `\ReviewerSection` unless you want the reviewer's counter to increase accordingly. A regular `\section*{...}` (e.g., `\section*{Meta-review}` or `\section*{Editor's comments}`) will do. Comment headers will then be printed without any preceding roman digits (e.g., numbered with 4 in place of III.4).

In the following, a couple examples are given. Later on in this page, the different levels of difficulty and the statuses of the referred modifications are listed. Look at the L^AT_EX code of this page for more information.

Comment
III.4

¹If you read "???" it must be because the referenced paper has no section labelled as "sec:introduction".

Comment III.5:

Another comment of Reviewer III.

Answer: Reply to Reviewer III.

Assignment: Author
Effort not estimated

Comment III.6:

Start of the reviewer's comment.

Answer: In-between reply of the authors.

Assignment: Author
Hard one

Reprise of the reviewer's comment.

Answer: In-between (or final) reply of the authors.

Assignment: Author
Done

Assignment: Author

