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1. Clarify the core contributions in the introduction.
   1. The unique proportion of your work, especially in terms of *specific performance gains* could be emphasized
   2. Briefly state why your architecture stands out compare to prior FPGA-based or ASIC-based CKKS implementations. For example, highlight something like: “we reduce area by X %”, or “we achieve Yx speedup,” up front. This helps reviewers identify the novelty and significance at a glance.

**Response:**

1. Tighten the background section
   1. The subsections on RNS-CKKS Ciphertext Multiplication, the Number Theoretic Transform (NTT), and Base Conversion (Sections II-A, II-B, II-C) are well structured. However, consider whether every detail is needed in the text. Some well-known NTT basics can be trimmed or replaced with references if space is tight.
   2. Ensure consistent notation.

**Response:**

1. Strengthen the “Proposed Architecture” Section
   1. This section is the core of your paper. To maintain a clear narrative, consider breaking it into *just a few distinct subsections,* each with a succinct heading that tells the reader exactly what is covered (e.g., “III-A. Top-Level Design,” “III-B. Configurable Processing Element,” “III-C. Memory Architecture and Data Flow”).
   2. Emphasize what is new or optimized in your approach. For instance, the paper describes how you adopt a parallel partial-product approach for Barrett modular multiplication. Consider highlighting specifically:
      1. The exact parallelization strategy.
      2. How you reduce the overall clock cycles compared to a baseline.
      3. Where you gain area or latency improvements compared to a naive or older approach.
   3. If you need more space, you can move some block-diagram details into a single figure. That way, references to subcomponents can remain in the text, but you avoid re-describing the same figure in words.

**Response:**

1. Discuss Key Implementation Details More Concisely.

**Response:**

1. The conclusion mentions balancing throughput and resource usage but doesn't discuss potential limitations of their approach. Every study has limitations; acknowledging them strengthens the paper. For example, maybe their architecture is optimized for specific parameter sets and doesn't generalize well, or perhaps there are trade-offs in configurability

**Response:**

1. Proofreading for grammar and clarity is essential.

**Response:**

1. The user should ensure that all acronyms are defined upon first use. For example, ENS is mentioned in the equations but isn't spelled out anywhere

**Response:**

1. Overall, the main issues are the placeholder percentages in the abstract, missing tables/figures, insufficient justification of parameters, lack of limitations discussion, and formatting/grammar issues. Addressing these would strengthen the paper's chances for acceptance.

**Response:**