Response to the Reviewers' Comments

We would like to thank the editor and the reviewers for their efforts and for providing constructive comments and feedback throughout the review process. We believe that the modification of the manuscript to address those remarks has further improved it. Detailed replies to reviewers' comments follows:

Reply to Reviewer #1:

This overview paper studies techniques which transfer the knowledge acquired by large deep learning models to smaller models, which can then be used in embedded and mobile devices.	We thank the reviewer for his/her efforts towards reviewing the manuscript and providing valuable feedback.
The level of English is adequate, apart from some minor grammatical errata that should be edited out: e.g. "The main objectives of this work" -> "The main objective of this work"; "Also, the paper discuss" -> "The paper also discusses"; "deep learning models use to run" -> "deep learning models are used to run" (or just "typically run").	We thank the reviewer for pointing these errors. We fixed them in the updated manuscript. In addition, we proofread the manuscript to fix grammar mistakes elsewhere, as well.
This study fits within the scope of the journal and there is no recent peer-reviewed review of the topic, to my knowledge. The overall structure of the paper has been improved and is now easier to follow. Diagrams have been added to complement method descriptions. Overall, the paper has received many improvements and the contents are now well organized and present the whole picture notably better. The only modification I would recommend is a quick revision for grammar mistakes such as those I marked above, for greater clarity. Apart from that, I would consider that this overview reaches publication quality.	We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her efforts towards reviewing the manuscript and providing encouraging feedback. We did a revision of the manuscript to fix the grammar mistakes and to increase the readability of the paper.

Reply to Reviewer #2:

As suggested, the authors have extended the background to include some of the concepts used along the paper. I would also move the definition of online and offline distillation (including figure 2) that now appears at the beginning of section 5 (lines 173-176) to the background.	We thank the reviewer for his/her efforts towards reviewing the manuscript and providing valuable feedback. We have updated the background to move the definition of online

	and offline distillation including figure 2.
The authors have also included a new section summarizing the applications, as requested. This section contributes making the paper more complete. New figures are quite useful to understand the background concepts and the categories used to classify the papers. The manuscript still contains some grammar mistakes (a few are listed below), so proof-reading is highly recommended before publication. - Section 1: The main objectives of this works is => are - Section1: Also, the paper discuss => discusses - Section 3: It's purposes => its purposes - Section 5: the two sub-category => subcategories - Section 6: deep learning models use to run => are usually run ? - Section 6: To be practically in use => To be of practical use - Section 6: To be low latency => To have low latency	We would like to thank the reviewer for providing encouraging feedback. We thank the reviewer for pointing these errors. We fixed them in the updated manuscript. In addition, we proofread the manuscript to fix grammar mistakes elsewhere, as well.
I am not fully satisfied with the answer given by the authors about the survey methodology. Even if they do not want to conduct a systematic literature search, the process followed to find and select the papers should be better explained in the manuscript. It seems that the survey is focused on recent works not included in previous surveys, so the covered period of time should be given. The names of the journals and conferences considered as "relevant", as well as the minimum citation count, should be reported as well. Even though these criteria might not be valid for a systematic review, the reader has the right to know how the authors choose papers. Otherwise, the "overview" of the area is strongly biased by the authors' interest on certain papers, but the reader is not aware of it.	Based on the feedback from the reviewer, we have updated the survey methodology by adding details on the paper selection criteria including the publication year and the venue.
The new organization of the survey section has greatly contributed readability. The authors have successfully addressed my comments about the validity of findings.	We would like to thank the reviewer for his/her efforts towards reviewing the manuscript and providing encouraging feedback.