

Response to Referee's Reports

on "All Ramsey numbers for brooms in graphs"

-5419-14533-2-SM

We are grateful to the editors and the referees for their invaluable comments and suggestions which help improve the quality of the paper. Following the comments completely, we have reviewed the manuscript, and the details are listed as follows.

old version	suggestion	new version	revision
page 1, line -10	'has' should replace 'with'	page 1, line -7	'with'→ 'has'
page 1, line -7	'which is from' should replace by 'under'	page 1, line -3	'which is from'→ 'under'
page 2, line 3,4	'is like the' is not well defined or explained.	page 2, line 7,8	'is like the'→ 'is similar to a'
page 2, line 4	'Among rarely known ... have been determined' ?	page 2, line 8	replaced by 'Among few known results of $R(T_n)$, $R(P_n)$ and $R(K_{1,n-1})$ have been determined , completely.'
page 2, line 17	what does 'may' mean?	page 2, line -10	We add that 'when l varies, as it is believed that $R(K_{1,n-1})$ is the maximum of $R(T_n)$ '
page 2, line -8	'if no danger of confusion'?	page 2, line -1	replaced by 'when there is no danger of confusion.'
page 2, line -6	should add ' $a+b=n$ '	page 3, line 2	add ' $a+b=n$ '
page 2, line -4	'We see that ' should replace 'Thus'	page 3, line 4	'Thus'→ 'We see that'
page 2, line -3	when maximizing twice, this should be made more clear.	page 3, line 6	We add that 'where a and b are determined by T_n .'
page 3, line 1	'via' should replace 'in'.	page 3, line 9	'in'→ 'via'
page 3, lemma 3	As a reader, I would have been interested in some indication of the approach used in proving this result.	page 3, lemma 5	We have pointed the reference [9] where the lemma comes from. However, the proof is long.

page 3, line 12	'opposite' should replace 'inverse'	page 3, line -11	'inverse'→ 'opposite'
page 3, line 14	' $R(C_{2k})=3k-1$ for $k>2$, see [6]' why not give a lemma like lemma 5?	page 3	we give a new lemma 6.
page 3, line 18	should add 'that' behind 'The fact'	page 3, line -5	follow the referee's comments
page 4, lemma 4	when maximizing twice, this should be made more clear.	page 5, lemma 7	follow the referee's comments
page 5, line 14	' $e(G)$ ' is defined early?	page 5, lemma 8	In lemma 8, we define ' $e(G)$ ' as usual.
page 5, line -6	When maximizing twice, this should be made more clear.	page 6, line 7	follow the referee's comments
Page 6, line-12	'Suppose opposite, then' should replace 'Since otherwise'	page 7, line 1	'Since otherwise'→ 'Suppose opposite, then'