Dear Editor and Reviewers,

We appreciate your comments to our submission and the opportunity to revise the submission. Your comments are very valuable and helpful to improve the quality of the paper. We have studied your comments vary carefully and revised the submission accordingly. We have provided the point-to-point responses to your comments as follows. We are hoping the revision can meet your exception and the requirements of the journal.

Thank you very much!

Fang Su, PhD

School of Economics and Management,

Shaanxi University of Science & Technology,

Xi'an, ShaanXi Province, P.R.C, 710021

Response to Referee is # 1

(1) The authors use the benchmark data sets of person re-identification, bankruptcy prediction and spam email detection to show the effectiveness of the proposed method. I am curious that why they choose the three data sets.

Response: The motive to use the data sets of person re-identification, bankruptcy prediction and spam email detection is to show that the proposed method can be generalized to different types of applications, including computer vision, natural language processing, and economics. We have explained this in line 45-48 of page 16.

(2) The experiments are not convincing. I do not think nine classification results on three datasets can show the effectiveness of the proposed method. The authors make a comparison with (Peng et al., 2017) and (Su et al., 2017). Peng et al. and Su et al. have carried out a large number of experiments. I advise the authors to provide more experimental evidence.

Response: We have provided more experimental evidences by conducting experiments three additional data sets used by Peng et al. and Su et al. The results over the additional data sets are shown in Figure 3 of page 19.

(3) This paper mainly relies on text descriptions and formulas, and it is not easy to read. Flowcharts and figures will be helpful to illustrate the method prosed in this paper.

Response: We have given a figure to illustrate the learning framework proposed in this paper, as in Figure 1 of page 4. We have also given a flowchart of the proposed algorithm in Figure 2 of page 15.

Response to Referee is # 2

1. In the section 2.1, in Equation (4), I cannot understand what is U standing for?

Response: The U should be replaced by the Theta. Theta is the mapping matrix of the linear mapping function for attribute vector. We have correct this typo and explained what is Theta is standing for in equ (4) and line 4 of page 6.

2. The implementation of your method is too brief, you should describe the details of your implementation.

Response: We have described the details of our implementation of the algorithm in line 1 - 11 of page 14. An additional algorithm description is given in Algorithm 1 of page 14, and an additional flowchart of the algorithm is given in Figure 2 of page 15.

3. Your experiments are not convictive enough. Firstly, the attributes that you annotate in CUHK03 should be described or be listed. Moreover, the configuration of the experiments and the evaluation metrics should be elaborated. Thirdly, compared with other methods, the reasons of your improvement should be described in detail.

Response: We have listed the attributes that we annotated in CUHK03 in Table 1 of page 17.

We have elaborated the configuration of the experiments and the evaluation metrics in line 1 of page 17 - line 9 of page 18.

We have described the reasons of your improvement over with other methods in detail in line 26 of page 18 - line 7 of page 19.

4. There are too many grammatical mistakes and spelling mistakes in your manuscript.

Response: We have done a careful proof-reading to the manuscript to correct all the found grammatical mistakes and spelling mistakes in our manuscript.