

Dear Editor,

We are writing regarding your email subject: “Decision on your manuscript APIN-D-19-01616”. Firstly, we want to highlight the second reviewer who we feel not only read the paper but provided suggestions and comments that have greatly improved the paper. As is evident by our revised manuscript and our response, we have fully taken these comments onboard and we look forward to any further scientific discussion with this reviewer.

Regarding the first reviewer, we have addressed their comments as best as possible. We would just like to bring to your attention the quality of their review:

- They make the following comment regarding the language, “The language needs to be revised by native speaker research.” As we indicate in our response, we are three native English speakers with vast experience of scientific publication; two of the authors are editors of journals and have published extensively. Furthermore, the fact that the English in this single sentence – and most of the review – is completely broken raises questions about this reviewer’s ability to judge the language.
- We question how much of the manuscript the reviewer has read. They make numerous assertions regarding claims in the paper that are simply not true. For example, “in this paper, as you claimed, benchmark datasets are proposed.” There is no point in the paper that makes such a claim and this is not at all what the paper is about. Note the second reviewer did not raise this.
- The reviewer asked us to expand our literature review and proposed six papers, all with a single author in common. These papers were not all related to the work. We have, however, tried our best to find some connection to two of them and included them in the manuscript. This further emphasises our previous point as to whether or not the reviewer has read the paper, and also raises a potential ethical question about a reviewer just getting more citations of their own work.

Thank you very much for reading this and we look forward to any further comments or suggestions from the second reviewer.