My Awesome but Very Long Paper Title That Spans Multiple Lines

Submitted to

IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications

Donald Duck[1,*] and Mickey Mouse[2]

[1] Department of Quacking, Duck University, Duckburg, USA
[2] Department of Mousing, Mouse University, Mouseton, USA

Dear Dr. Doom,

Please find enclosed the revised version of our previous submission entitled "My Awesome but Very Long Paper Title That Spans Multiple Lines" with manuscript number TWC-2020-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 to 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.

Authors' Response to the Editor

General Comments. 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: 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.

Concluding Response to the Editor. Thank you for your valuable comments on our manuscript. We have done our best to incorporate changes to reflect the suggestions, which allowed us to improve the quality of our work.

Authors' Response to Reviewer 1

General Comments. General comment about the work.

Response: Thank you for your feedback.

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

Comment 1

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

Response: 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 2

Everything else is really good.

Response: 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.

Comment 3

If we have a
very long comment
that spans
many lines
we can pass arguments

to the underlying tcolorbox,
such as `breakable`
to allow breaking up
the comment box.

Response: Thank you for the comment.

That is a great feature. Thank you.

Concluding Response. Thank you for your valuable comments on our manuscript.

Authors' Response to Reviewer 2

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

Response: Thank you for your feedback.

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

Comment 1

The work is not really good.

Response: Thank you for the comment.

:(

Comment 2

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

Response: 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 actually 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].

Comment 3

The template you are using for responding to my comments is excellent.

Response: Thank you for the comment.

We agree.

One cool feature is that comments are automatically labeled with the following pattern: `comment:<rev_num>.<comment_num>`, which can then be used in a `\ref` command. So this comment has number 3. (Note that this also automatically changes if the `revnumtocomment` class option is enabled.)

To automatically add the label in front of the number, we can use `\autoref`: Comment 3.

It is also possible to set an additional custom label by passing the `label` option to the comment environment, e.g., Comment 1 was mean.

Authors' Response to Reviewer 3

Comment 1

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

Response: 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 actually exists...