

Cover Letter (TPAMI-2025-R1)

IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence

Manuscript ID: TPAMI-2025-R1

Manuscript Title: Some Awesome Title of Your Amazing Manuscript and Some Awesome Title of Your Amazing Manuscript

Authors: Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse

Dear Dr. Doom,

Thank you for your appreciation of our work. We have diligently revised the manuscript in accordance with the reviewers' comments, with the most significant changes outlined below:

Please find enclosed the revised version of our previous submission entitled "Some Awesome Title of Your Amazing Manuscript and Some Awesome Title of Your Amazing Manuscript" with manuscript number TPAMI-2025-R1. We would like to thank you and the reviewers for the valuable comments which help improving the quality of our manuscript. In this revision, we have carefully addressed the reviewers' comments. A summary of main modifications and a detailed point-by-point response to the comments from Reviewers 1 and 3 (following the reviewers' order in the decision letter) are given below.

We believe that the **Some Awesome Title of Your Amazing Manuscript and Some Awesome Title of Your Amazing Manuscript** is innovative enough, and we sincerely appreciate your comments and time in improving our manuscript.

Sincerely,

Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse

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

Response to the Associate Editor

General Comment

The reviewer(s) have suggested some minor revisions to your manuscript. Therefore, I invite you to respond to the reviewer(s)' comments and revise your manuscript.

General Response: We appreciate your handling of the review process.

According to the reviewers' comments, we have checked our manuscript and addressed them in the following way:

1. We added content.
2. We removed our wrong statements in Section I.

Response to Reviewer 1

General Comment

Overall, this is a good paper...

General Response: Thank you for the comment.

Thank you for your positive feedback.

Comment 1.1

Your work is really good. However, you should change the title. [1]

Response 1.1: 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 1.2

Everything else is really good.

Response 1.2: 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 really important sentence was added to the paper. This really important sentence was added to the paper. This really important sentence was added to the paper. This really important sentence was added to the paper.

Comment 1.3

Everything else is really good.

Response 1.3: 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.

Response to Reviewer 2

Comment 2.1

The work is not really good.

Response 2.1: Thank you for the comment.

:(
:(

Comment 2.2

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

Response 2.2: Thank you for the comment.

We are aware that citations on Google Scholar are very important to you. Therefore, we added reference [2].

Also check out our article [1].

And btw, your Comment 2.1 was mean!

Response to Reviewer 3

Comment 3.1

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

Response 3.1: 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 [3] here, it will again be number [1].

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

And reference [1] for Reviewer 2 [2] is now number [2].

References

- [1] K.-L. Besser and E. A. Jorswieck, “Reliability bounds for dependent fading wireless channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, vol. 19, no. 9, pp. 5833–5845, 9 2020.
- [2] R. N. Two, “My work is better than yours,” 1990.
- [3] K.-L. Besser and E. A. Jorswieck, “Bounds on the secrecy outage probability for dependent fading channels,” *IEEE Transactions on Communications*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 443–456, 1 2021.