

# Title of the paper

## Revision notes

Claudio Di Ciccio\*<sup>1</sup>, Author Ecs<sup>2</sup>, Writer Why<sup>3</sup>, and Contributor Zed<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Sapienza University of Rome, Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*University of a City, World*

<sup>3</sup>*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 1

### Comment I:

*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 2

### Comment II:

*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**

## Reviewer 3

### Comment III:

*The manuscript has a very intriguing title.*

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

**Assignment:** Claudio  
**Done**

## How to use commands for this response letter

This template was used, among others, for the letters produced during the revision rounds of [1]. **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}`*

### Comment IV:

*Comment of Reviewer N.*

### Answer:

Reply of the authors.

**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 ...*

Comment  
IV

```
\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}]{N}
```

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

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 ??”<sup>1</sup> is here generated by this L<sup>A</sup>T<sub>E</sub>X 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}
```

**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`.

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.

### Comment V:

*Comment of Reviewer N.*

**Answer:** Reply to Reviewer.

**Assignment:** Author  
Effort not estimated

---

<sup>1</sup>If you read “??” it must be because the referenced paper has no section labelled as “sec:introduction”.

**Comment VI:**

*Start of the reviewer’s comment.*

**Answer:** In-between reply of the authors.

*Reprise of the reviewer’s comment.*

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

**Assignment:** Author  
**Hard one**

**Assignment:** Author  
**Done**

**Assignment:** Author

Effort not estimated

Feasible

Medium effort

Time-consuming

Hard one

Death

Work in progress

Almost there

Done

## References

- [1] Alessio Cecconi, 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.