

Response to Reviewers

Manuscript #2024-0417 — “A Scalable Framework for ...”

Submitted to the *Journal of ...*

Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We thank the editor and both reviewers for their careful reading and constructive feedback. We have revised the manuscript accordingly; below we respond to each point in turn. Reviewer comments are shown in **amber**, our responses in **green**, and quoted changes to the manuscript are set in shaded italics.

Reviewer 1

Comment 1.1

The motivation in the introduction is clear, but the paper does not compare against the baseline of Smith et al. (2022), which addresses a similar problem.

Response. We agree this comparison strengthens the paper. We have added Smith et al. (2022) to Section 4.2 and report results in the updated Table 3, where our method improves accuracy by 6.4 points. The revised passage reads:

Compared with Smith et al. (2022), our approach achieves a 6.4-point gain in top-1 accuracy while using 30% fewer parameters ...

Comment 1.2

Equation (3) is difficult to follow; please define all symbols on first use.

Response. We have expanded the notation immediately after Eq. (3) and now define λ , Φ , and η explicitly on first use.

Reviewer 2

Comment 2.1

The experimental section lacks error bars, making it hard to judge significance.

Response. Thank you — we now report mean $\pm$ standard deviation across five random seeds in all figures and tables (Section 5), and add a paired t -test confirming significance at $p < 0.01$.

Comment 2.2

A discussion of limitations would improve the paper.

Response. We have added a new *Limitations* subsection (Section 6.3) discussing scalability to larger datasets and sensitivity to hyperparameters.

We believe these revisions have substantially improved the manuscript and thank the reviewers again for their time.

Sincerely,
The Authors