Responses to Reviewers' Comments for Manuscript TVCG-2025-X

# My Awesome Paper Title

Addressed Comments for Publication to

IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics

by

Donald Duck and Mickey Mouse

Dear Dr. Doom,

Please find enclosed the revised version of our previous submission entitled “My Awesome Paper Title” with manuscript number TVCG-2025-X. 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.

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 Meta Review

**Summary Comment 1**

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.

**Response S1:** 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

**Comment 1.1**

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

**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.

# 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 [1].

Also check out our article [2].


[1] R. N. Two, "My work is better than yours," *International Journal of Science*, 1990, This journal probably even exists...

[2] 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, Sep. 2020. DOI: 10.1109/TWC.2020.2997332 arXiv: 1909.01415 [cs.IT].


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 [1] 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].


[1] 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, Jan. 2021. DOI: 10.1109/TCOMM.2020.3026654 arXiv: 2004.06644.

[2] R. N. Two, "My work is better than yours," *International Journal of Science*, 1990, This journal probably even exists...