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\noindent Dear Reviewers of the current version,

\hbox{ }

\noindent Looking at the previous reviews, you will realise that our earlier version is rejected with \textbf{borderline score} at KR 2020. Almost all of the major criticisms are from the review of Reviewer~1 (whom we can't thank enough). That review was really helpful for us both in terms of its depth and the comprehensiveness. Hence, we owe the majority of these improvements to these criticisms. While we were trying to address them, we have realised additional rooms of improvements and made changes where we see necessary, to make it even a better paper.

Below, we list and briefly explain all of the changes and improvements between the KR 2020 submission and the current submission.

\begin{enumerate}

\item We realise that the majority of the issues were due to weak exposition. It created confusion about the meaning and even the correctness of our results. Therefore, we have gone through the whole text, and rewritten the most of these inline texts (including the introduction, and the layout) and added further explanations where we see necessary. Furthermore, we simplified the text, and removed the confusing parts which deemed unnecessary or redundant (i.e., pseudo-code for transform and resolution processes).

\item In the earlier version, as reported by the reviewer, (transformation and resolution) rules were only listed in appendix which was inconvenient, which we understand. Following reviewer's advice, in this version, we have added the transformation and resolution rules (listed in Table~1 and Table~2) for the convenience of the exposition.

\item Instead of giving the “The Connect Process” and “EF-implication rules” (in the old version), in this version we have provided with a new theorem, called “Generalised Ackermann’s Lemma”, and used it to eliminate the new introduced atoms as possible.

\item In addition, we have also added an additional remark that our method could also help the satisfiability solver CTL-RP to result in faster by the ‘removal’ of some SNF$\_{CTL}^g$ clauses.

\item Last, we have also revised our technical appendix and elaborated our proofs further, since we realised it could cause potential misunderstandings in the main content.

\end{enumerate}

We hope we could address the concerns of our earlier reviewers, and improved our manuscript substantially well-enough to match our current reviewers' expectations.

\hbox{ }

\noindent Best Regards,\\

\noindent Authors
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