

Responses to Referees' Comments for Manuscript LX12345 Einstein

My Awesome Paper Title

Addressed Comments for Publication in

Physical Review Lottery

by

Albert Einstein, Max Planck and Alan Turing

August 6, 2024

Dear Sir Newton,

We appreciate your handling of the review process. Please find enclosed the revised version of our previous manuscript LX12345 Einstein entitled “My Awesome Paper Title” for reconsideration in Physical Review Lottery.

We would like to thank you and Referees for the valuable comments which help improving the quality of our manuscript.

In this revision, we have carefully addressed all Referees’ comments.

A summary of main modifications and a detailed point-by-point response to the comments from Referees are given below.

Sincerely,

Albert Einstein, Max Planck and Alan Turing

Summary of Changes

To enhance the legibility of this response letter, all comments are typeset in boxes. Rephrased or added sentences are typeset in color. The respective parts in the manuscript are highlighted to indicate changes.

1. Based on [Comment A1](#), we have added
2. Based on [Comment B1](#), we have removed
3. Based on [Comment C1](#), we have highlighted

Authors' Response to Referee A

General Comments of Referee A

General comment about the work.

Response A0: Thank you for your feedback.

We have carefully addressed all the issues item by item as follows.

Comment A1

Your work is really good. However, you should change the title.

Response A1: Thank you for the comment.

We agree that the title is somewhat misleading. We therefore changed it in the current version of the manuscript.

Comment A2

Everything else is really good.

Response A2: Thank you for the comment.

We totally agree. We also added the following to the new version of the manuscript:

This really important sentence was added to the paper.

This conclusion agrees with the preprint [A1].

References for Referee A

[A1] G. Perelman, The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications, 2002, [arXiv:math/0211159](#).

Authors' Response to Referee B

General Comments of Referee B

In general, the work is well-written. However, I have the following concerns.

Response B0: Thank you for your feedback.

We have carefully addressed all the issues item by item as follows.

Comment B1

The work is not really good.

Response B1: Thank you for the comment.

:(

Comment B2

You forgot to cite a very important reference (where I am an author)!

Response B2: Thank you for the comment.

We are aware that citations on Google Scholar are very important to you. Therefore, we added reference [B1]. Also check out our article [B2].

BTW, your [Comment B1](#) was mean! (We can use the `\autoref` command.)

References for Referee B

[B1] B. Referee, My work is better than yours, *Physical Review Lottery* (2000).

[B2] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?, [Physical Review](#) **47**, 777 (1935).

Authors' Response to Referee C

Comment C1

Did you know, that the references can be separated for the individual referees?

Response C1: Thank you for the comment.

Yes. When using `biblatex`, you can use the `refsection=section` option to achieve that.

If we cite a new reference like [C1] here, it will be number [C1].

Note that you might have to run `pdflatex` and `biber` multiple times.

The reference [B1] in [Response B2](#) is now number [C2].

References for Referee C

- [C1] A. M. Turing, On Computable Numbers, with an Application to the Entscheidungsproblem, [Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society](#) **s2-42**, 230 (1936).
- [C2] B. Referee, My work is better than yours, Physical Review Lottery (2000).