Author Response to Reviews of

Making Dams All Day Every Day

E. Beaver, H. Bee, S.N. Mole, S. Shrimp

| *Reviewer Comment*
Author Response
□ Manuscript Text

Dear Editors,

We thank the reviewers and editor for their thoughtful feedback and comments in improving this work. The rebuttal letter is organized with sections delineated by the review, shown in the table of contents.

Sincerely,

Dr. Eager Beaver
on behalf of all authors

1. Reviewer One

Summary

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetuer adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetuer id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Nam dui ligula, fringilla a, euismod sodales, sollicitudin vel, wisi. Morbi auctor lorem non justo. Nam lacus libero, pretium at, lobortis vitae, ultricies et, tellus. Donec aliquet, tortor sed accumsan bibendum, erat ligula aliquet magna, vitae ornare odio metus a mi. Morbi ac orci et nisl hendrerit mollis. Suspendisse ut massa. Cras nec ante. Pellentesque a nulla. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Aliquam tincidunt urna. Nulla ullamcorper vestibulum turpis. Pellentesque cursus luctus mauris.

Comments

1.1 Line 12 → 12

You say "Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum". Please check the grammar.

This is correct. We have not changed it.

Note that the first instance of Line 12 comes from the user manually copying it over from the reviewer. The second instance of 12 comes from the label *in your draft revision*. This label should be set by you right after you read the review (most likely, this is a good use of your time, too). Your rebuttal letter will automatically keep track of where the changes you make end up being in the revised manuscript as long as you don't delete the original command: \llabel{ tag }.

If you need to put the line number directly in the text, you can simply use \ref{ prefix tag }. Please note that there will be a prefix added to your tag from the other document, which you can change in \externaldocument[prefix]{ path to document } in preamble.tex.

1.2 Line 50

This doesn't make any sense to me.

Notice that this uses the same macro, \lreviewer, but leaves the second input blank.

2. Reviewer Two

2.1 Line 50

> *This statement is confusing as written.*

Thank you. We have removed this accordingly. This agrees with Comment 1.2.

This was written with the macro, `\reviewer`, that only takes two inputs, i.e. it does not offer any line tracking.

2.2 Line 99

> *Please check Schrodinger's cat.*

The cat in the box is ~~dead~~alive.

$$E = mc^2 \tag{1}$$

$$m \cdot a = F v = p. \tag{2}$$

You can use the `quote` and `latexdiff` packages to format changes to the text like this as well.