Thanks to all the reviewers for useful comments and suggestions.

Reviewer\_1-Q1, We did not include more recent bug localization techniques, because they are not closely related to our work. For example, 1) Amalgam is based on five components – four of them except version history are not considered in our proposed approach, 2) BRTracer consider segmentation and stack trace analysis, which we don’t, 3) BLIZZARD is a query reformulation based bug localization technique, while our proposed approach does not focus on any kind of query reformulation.

Reviewer\_2-Q2, We normalize the association score by dividing the association score of a given source file and the maximum association score calculated from all source files for a given query bug report.

Reviewer\_2-Q3: For a given training dataset, we need to create the association map once. So, even if takes a while to analyze the bug-fix commit history, it does not require to be repeated.

Reviewer\_3: We are well aware of the problem with 10-fold cross validation, we performed this validation technique on our dataset to test that our proposed approach is working or not. However, in practical there is no such way to learn from future instance. So, there will be no risk in this regard.

Reviewer\_1-Q2: In our proposed approach we combine our implicit association score with lexical similarity score (i.e., VSM technique). As our proposed approach already has a component of one (i.e., VSM) of our baseline techniques (i.e., VSM, LSI), we separated the baselines and state of the art techniques, to ensure a fare comparison to check the applicability of BLuAMIR.

Reviewer\_1-Major: We get the bug report (i.e., title and description of a bug) from several bug tracking repository such as <https://bugs.eclipse.org/bugs/> and then we go through all commit messages and collect the changeset for each bug report.