

## I. OVERALL COMMENTS

We thank our reviewers for their careful and constructive feedback to improve the paper. Among the requested revisions, we have incorporated the following suggestions:

- We have added a paragraph to the introduction and conclusion to better position our work among the existing voice assistants, indicating its relationship with bots.
- We state clearly in the abstract the paper is an experience report rather than a case study.
- We have improved the scoping of Section VI to specify the version used for reproducibility and provide a more thorough discussion of the models' performance.

## II. REVIEWER I

We add an outline of the architecture of Idiolect in Section II.

We specify the version of the OS, IDE and plugin version used to evaluate the models.

The most suitable model we tested was `vosk-model-small-en-us-0.22` with an average WER of 0.63. We have added a sentence in the discussion to clarify this.

We have removed the paragraph identifying the geographic distribution of our users.

Lacking a corpus of voice recordings, we used synthetic voices as an integration test for the plugin. Synthetic voices are intended to be an integration test, but not representative of the true population, and we have added a paragraph under Threats to Validity to address this limitation.

## III. REVIEWER II

Idiolect was recently re-released, but shares very little in common with its original edition. We drew from our experience developing the original plugin to inform its design and implementation, but neither the original plugin nor its reimplementations were ever submitted to or published by any conference, journal or workshop. The original plugin can be found here, but we omit the link from the paper to avoid any confusion: <https://plugins.jetbrains.com/plugin/7910-idear>.

## IV. REVIEWER III

We have added a sentence to the introduction explaining the plugin's history. We report downloads to show the plugin's original popularity, which fell shortly thereafter due to lack of maintenance and configuration issues. Word-error-rate (WER) is a well-known metric for evaluating speech recognition systems that we use to measure the accuracy of various models.