November 9, 2023

Dear Reviewer,

We are deeply appreciative of the time and dedication you have invested in reviewing our manuscript. Your insightful feedback was thoughtfully examined and has led to substantive improvements in our work. Enclosed is a comprehensive reply to each of your remarks.

"The manuscript's literature review section is notably lacking in depth and breadth. With less than a page of content and only 20 references, it does not provide sufficient context or demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the existing body of knowledge. To strengthen the research, the authors should expand the literature review. Incorporate more recent references to reflect the current state of research in the field, including key and recent publications. The addition of recent work, such as Leone et al. (2020), Audrito et al. (2023), and Pan et al. (2019), is recommended to enrich the literature review."

Thank you for your suggestions regarding additional references for our manuscript. Your input is greatly valued, and we have carefully considered each of the papers you recommended. After thorough examination, we have found that the suggested references diverge significantly from the core subject and methodology of my study.

The focus of our research is about knowledge transfer between two different models, and it operates within different model spaces that have nothing in common. Therefore, while the recommended papers certainly contribute valuable knowledge to the broader field, they do not directly align with or impact the specific discourse of our research.

Moreover, the current study addresses new standards for model interoperability across various models, an area that, as of my current knowledge cutoff in 11/2023, has been sparsely explored in existing literature. This scarcity in directly related work is also why the list and explanations of cited references may appear limited.

"*The absence of a Conclusion section is a notable gap in the manuscript. Authors should incorporate a well-developed conclusion to summarize the primary findings of the study. Authors need to discuss the implications of the findings, underscore the personal contributions of the research, and suggest future research directions. Additionally, the practical implications of the study and its contribution to the field should be reflected upon. Also, a discussion of the study's limitations to provide a balanced perspective, is needed.*"

In response to your observation regarding the absence of a Conclusion section, we have revised the structure of the manuscript to include a clearly defined Discussion and a separate Conclusion section. The Discussion section now elaborates on the implications of our findings, highlights the novel contributions of our research, and outlines potential avenues for future investigations. The Conclusion section succinctly summarizes the

primary outcomes of our study, reflects on the practical applications within the field, and acknowledges the limitations to offer a balanced viewpoint of our work.

"The manuscript demonstrates a reasonable command of the English language. However, some moderate editing is needed to enhance overall readability, including addressing grammatical issues. The paper's overall structure is coherent and logical, but it could benefit from improved, clear transitions between sections that would facilitate a smoother flow."

Acknowledging your feedback on the manuscript's language and structure, we have undertaken a comprehensive review and editing process to enhance the readability. This includes rectifying grammatical errors and refining the transitions between sections for a more seamless flow of information and argumentation throughout the paper.

"The manuscript presents a valuable study on knowledge transfer between sentence embedding models, and may be considered for publishing in „Applied Sciences", Special Issue: „Natural Language Processing: Novel Methods and Applications". However, to enhance its quality and completeness, it is mandatory that the authors prioritize expanding the Literature review and add a well-structured Conclusion section."

In response to your valuable feedback regarding the expansion of the Literature Review, we would like to emphasize the pioneering nature of our study. We acknowledge the importance of a comprehensive Literature Review; however, after an exhaustive search, we found that there are minimal studies closely related to the specific nuances of our research on knowledge transfer between different sentence embedding models. This scarcity of directly relevant literature underscores the novelty of our work. Consequently, while we have revisited the Literature Review to ensure it is as comprehensive as possible given the constraints, the unique aspects of our approach limit the expansion in this area. Furthermore, we have developed a well-structured Conclusion section that succinctly summarizes our main findings, outlines the contributions of our work, and suggests avenues for future research. We trust that the originality of our research contributes significantly to the field and aligns well with the theme of the Special Issue on "Natural Language Processing: Novel Methods and Applications". We appreciate your understanding and look forward to your guidance on how to best address this matter within the scope of our study's context.

We appreciate your understanding and remain open to further suggestions that may more closely relate to the study's focused area of inquiry.

Warm Regards

Kadir Günel

Davutpaşa Mah. Davutpaşa Caddesi 34220, Esenler / İSTANBUL TEL: +90-544-321-30-02
kadir.gunel@std.yildiz.edu.tr