**Letter with changes**

1. Review #1

The first review had the following changes:

**Issue #1.** „*my main concerns are about presentation style and clarity of presenting facts, as follows. Also, the text is to be proof-read by an English professional*”

1. Full review of English grammar and clarity of the sentences and paragraphs.

**Issue #2.** “*could not find enough discussion how the authors’ work is related to the previously presented related works. This should be a section where the authors clearly elaborate their ideas about the MTree improvements with respect to other references and findings*”

1. Specific reference (i.e., #31) the paper from 2012 which described the general approach for using Mtree as a clusterer.
2. Clarify that is the input, logic of the tree, better presentation of the Mtree package, improve presentation of the Execution of MTree in Weka GUI.
3. Review #2

**Issue #1. „how the authors’ work is related to the previously presented related works”**

* In page 2, paragraph 6, we state that „This paper presents an improved version of the works from [30 and 31]”
* In page 4, paragraph 4, we state that ” we also target when improving the initial version of the MTree clustering algorithm within Weka package”
* In page 4, 1-st paragraph of the \* Proposed approach\* section we state that:
  + We have proposed the initial clustering algorithm based on MTrees in [31].
  + The main limitation was that it was designed to cluster only students
  + The maximum number of items (i.e., nrKeys) was a magic number, so we could not dynamically set the number of items at runtime
  + The key aspects of improvement: ” flexible parametrized version of the former in terms of division policy, used distance, the method for finding and setting the number of clusters”
* In page 5, after Definition 1 there are stated the key features of the improved Mtree algorithm.
* Most of the papers from from Section 2. Related works used spatial data structures such that a new clusterer based on Mtrees may be suitable for tackeling other problems.

**Issue #2. „The definitions of some notions are given in an unclear way” ... „completely revise Section 3.1, and consequently Section 3.2, so as to improve the clarity of introducing things”**

Section 3.1 and 3.2 have been reviewed for clarity.

**Issue #3.**

**„The phrase “that indexes a set of objects into its leaves” is not clear, at all.” ...**

The definition was reviewed.

**„an illustrative example is more than needed here”**

We added Figures KK and KK1.

**Issue #4. „nothing is said about the semantics of the notions given in Table 1”**

A short description of each field is provided in Table 1.

A paragraph with detailed description has been appended.

**Issue #5. „Review Definition 1”**

Definition 1 has been reviewed.

**Issue #6. „Paragraph 11th: “The MTree uses only one node data structure...” --> The whole explanation here is to be followed by some illustrative examples.”**

Ilustrative exammples and exmplanations have been added for the internal structure a a node (root and leaf), for the tree and for the split function.

**Issue #7. „Algorithms 1 and 2 need explanations”**

Each algorithm has a one paragraph description.

**Issue #8. „The notion of a *clear structure* needs a precise definition”**

Clear structure has been replaced with well-defined structure, and a description of a well-defined dataset is provided.