*Use of "translational building blocks" in the title and rest of the paper.*

* Change the tile

*Inclusion of failure examples with detailed analysis of failure modes.*

* (2014/11/03) Show failure cases due to inaccurate offset statistics and inaccurate label
* Façade(155) non-repetitive object is not detected.
* Façade(215) Inaccurate detection
* Façade(333) complex structure that do not have regularity.
* Façade(0) global reflective symmetry

*Demonstration of technique on more non-facade examples, unless the claimed contribution is scaled down to facade-like images. If more non-façade examples were to be use, be explicit about the types that work.*

* Scaled down to façade like image.
* Emphasize the advantage of low level approach

*Comparison with representative images from Kwatra 2005, Simakov 2008, Pritch et al 2009, and especially He and Sun 2012 (since that work is also based on translational assumption). It is ok if they are failure examples*

* Produce images from Kwatra 2005. (2014/11/02)
* Produce images from Simakov 2008. (2014/11/02)
* Produce images from Pritch 2009. (2014/11/02)
* Produce images from He 2012. (2014/11/02)

*Demonstration of examples where the image is expanded by a fraction of the size of a building block*

* Find such an example. (2014/11/03). Many of such examples. Our method is able to adjust the gap between the building blocks by synthesizing the gap in between as “textures”.
* When possible, it will also try to select different (smaller) building block to fill the gap, see Façade(214).
* We create a montage that is slightly larger than the synthesis image; this allows regular structure to propagate outside of the image boundary. This usually give more natural result when no compatible structure can be generated inside of a given image size, see Façade(163),
* The important thing is it will try not to generate a seam that go across building blocks, see nor generate miss-aligned features.
* However it cannot always produce satisfactory solution, due to the numerical solution may not be semantically plausible.

*Expansion of the user study as described in the rebuttal to include a fair distribution of input images, especially using images from He and Sun 2012.*

* Add such images. (2014/11/02)

*Writing changes as promised in the rebuttal*

*Additional:*

* A detail explanation of how synthesis works, with statistical evidence of improvement brought by each additional label cost. (2014/11/03)
* Example of image completion. (2014/11/01)
* A system pipeline(teaser) (2014/11/03)

*Left to do:*

*Write about synthesis details (intermediate result) (2014/11/03), using one/two examples*

* *Talk about the energy term, show it improves the synthesis*
* *Talk about how to create generator, show it improves the synthesis further*

*Write about how to handle incompatible image size (2014/11/04)*

*Write about failure examples (2014/11/04)*

*Write about synthesis results (statistics of comparison, different datasets) (2014/11/04)*

*Consolidate the claim of the paper (2014/11/04)*

*Polishing text (2014/11/05)*

*Response technique details to each reviewers (2014/11/06)*

*write a cover letter (2014/11/06)*

*Change the teaser; add close-up view of the labeling artifacts. Refer it in the introduction. (2014/11/06)*

*Polish figures and supplementary materials (2014/11/07)*

*Response to reviewers:*

*R61:*

*Re-run grasp and discuss the result as in the rebuttal.*

*More discussion w.r.t grasp (use spectral cluster instead of greedy search)*

*Section 4.3.1. There was discussion already and we added the required results and discussion as well.*

*Reference*

*Discuss missing data due to occlusion deformations of various forms: geometry, color, shadow/lighting: hog plus co-occurrence analysis*

*Discussed in the limitation and future work.*

*point to the details of the synthesis evaluation.*

*R91:*

*Discuss wang et al.*

*Discussed in the related work, symmetry detection part.*

*Discussion about scale difference and distortion:*

*Discussed in conclusion and future work, and in Section 4.3.1.*

*Artifacts in video recording.*

*R95:*

*Technique terms: linear SVM, non-maxima suppression, Potts model, Hungarian’s algorithm*

*SVM added in section 3.1, learning.*

*Non-maxima suppression explained in section 3.1, rebuilding the dictionary.*

*Potts model: section 5.1.1*

*Hungarian’s algorithm: is not used any more.*

*Show comprehensive evaluation of synthesis images with detail analysis in the supplementary materials.*

*R3:*

*Cluster representation: detect peaks from the cluster’s median*

*We reprahse the explanation in section 3.2.*

*over-claim the generality of the approach (lines 276-279, 839-840). Reposition it*

*achieving robust unsupervised detection on facade-like patterns from the front view*

*might be*

*Line 189: could directly BE used*

*Line 178: restricted to images THAT HAVE a global*

*R43:*

*"unreliable data" (line 83). Do the authors mean "real data with minor variations in appearance of repeated elements"?*

*real world images with some variations in the appearance of repeated elements*

*I'm not sure why the authors misspelled "co-occurrence" as "co-occurance" and "co-occurrance" in a number of places.*

*All changed to co-occurrence*

*Another typo under "Algorithm 1": "Parising".*

*Missing reference*

*Re-address the non-trivial of translational pattern.*

*In section 4.3.1 and in the introduction.*

*Show more non-façade examples.*

*Address the incompatible cases*