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Author’s response to reviews:

Dear Reviewers, Attached is our revised submission for "GatewayNet: A Form of Sequential Rule Mining" which we believe addresses the comments left by the previous review panel. Below is a list of changes that we have made: - Added disclaimer that the funding bodies did not have any role in the design, analysis, of the data nor in writing in the manuscript.- Expanded Tbl 1. to include more data, then worked through several examples of how to calculate the measures in the "Implementation" section, specifically placing it in its "Gateway Rules" subsection. - Added a subsection "Comparison to Existing Software" to discussion which compares GatewayNet to an implementation based off of SPMF, a rule mining platform developed by Phillippe Fournier-Viger. This was chosen because it provides both the SPAM and SPADE algorithms and to simplify interoperation. This subsection describes how we used SPMF's output for these algorithms to construct a gateway network and includes that network visualized. It describes some caveats which interfere with the construction of the network, but notes that the network constructed using SPMF approaches that of GatewayNet. Processing using the ClaSP algorithm was attempted, but the memory requirements were high enough that the heap was exhausted even with 256 GiB of memory. There have been some technical comments left by the editor which we believe are either already addressed or which we are not sure how to properly implement; for instance, all figures are already in the back matter and their legends broken out from their source images. The email addresses for each author have been listed in their corresponding author blocks since the initial submission and are correct; however, the document class provided does not seem to provide any provision to render them. There was some question raised by Reviewer 2 as to the novelty of this manuscript, as he has noted that testing the Gateway Hypothesis is a natural use case for SRM. We agree; however, this nonetheless has not (to our knowledge) been reported in the literature. Because of this, we maintain our claim that this represents a contribution to the literature. Thank you for your reconsideration of this submission. If there is anything that we may do to further meet your requirements or may otherwise be of assistance, please do not hesitate to let us know. Regards, Phillip Kilgore