To the Editor:

I wish to thank the editor and reviewer of my paper. I feel this paper has improved with each revision. I am happy to report that I have followed all suggestions made by the reviewer and have modified the manuscript accordingly. Enclosed is a point-by-point commentary on all suggested changes. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to improve my manuscript.

**Reviewer 1**

In the previous submission, I complained that the intro text using the “replication crisis” as the main argument for use of graphics was wafer thin. The author has compressed this to a paragraph, but it still reads as a non-sequitur. Graphics per se do not provide a solution to these problems of sample size, pre- registration, etc. It might be better to cast this opening paragraph as a contrast between confirmatory, inferential statistics and exploratory, graphical methods. What would be lost (other than author ego) by deleting para 1?

Response: The opening paragraph was deleted, as suggested. The document now begins with the advantages of visualization: “Graphics offer many advantages over traditional methods that rely on tables and reported statistics. First, …”

The statement on p. 5, para 2: “The graphics produced by flexplot were developed using empirically- derived heurstics that maximize perceptual understanding, while minimizing perceptual biases (Fife, Longo, Correll, & Tremoulet, in press; Fife et al., 2019).” May be good press, but it evokes a cringe in those who know about human-factors research into graphical perception. Flexplot can certainly claim to simplify the process of creating meaningful graphs with decent perceptual properties, but cannot claim any optimality.

Response: I see how this could be misinterpreted. I modified the sentence such that we now remove any mention of “minimizing.” The new sentence reads as, “This paper introduces flexplot, an R package specifically designed to remove obstacles to sound visualizations. The graphics produced by flexplot were developed using empirically-derived heuristics (see Fife, Longo, Correll, and Tremoulet, 2020, for a review)”.

Figure 1: The image in the ms. looks too muddy to print.

Response: I appreciate the attention to detail. The former image had a lower resolution image. The current revision uses a much higher resolution graphic.

p. 8: Using GLM for the general linear model risks confusion with glm() for the generalized linear model. Perhaps use just LM.

Response: This was a good suggestion. I changed all instances of GLM with LM (except when I’m referring to generalized linear models).

p. 9, para 2: “The GLM equation ... doesn’t not have vertical pipes ...” First, this is an LM formula, not an equation.

Response: This is correct. I changed the language to reflect that. The text now reads as, “Most obviously, a LM formula (e.g., plot(y ~x1 + x2 + x3, data = data)) does not have any vertical pipes (|) as flexplot does…”

Second, other modeling methods (mixed models) and plots (e.g., visreg, car::scatterplot) do use “|” notation to condition on other variables to produce multiple panels.

Response: I agree that other packages use “|” notation. I was making the (minor) point that there’s consistency in how formulae are specified across flexplot and lm. However, I have added a parenthetical statement that notes these other packages use them: “…(though other modeling procedures and R packages do, such as mixed models in lmer; Bates, Mächler, Bolker, and Walker (2015); coplots in the car packages; and the visreg package).”

p. 11, para 2: Does flexplot allow coercion to a factor in the model formula (vs. in the data.frame)? E.g., y ~ as.factor(group) It would be useful to do this.

Response: This was a good idea. The most recent update to flexplot (version 0.10.7) allows users to specify a function within the formula (not just as.factor). I have updated the manuscript to reflect that: “…Alternatively, one can use the factor function within a flexplot function (e.g., flexplot(y~factor(group), data=d)).”

p. 15, bottom, code: Please remove jokes from comments in code for journal publication

Response: The jokes have been removed.

p 16, code: simplify by using

within(tablesaw.injury, {injury = factor(injury, ...})

Response: Done.

p. 21 (and elsewhere): rather than repeating theme() in each subplot, you could use theme\_set() or theme\_update()

Response: Excellent suggestion. I’ve updated all instances where I repeated the same theme elements.

p. 31: Use tinyurl or bit.ly to reduce the youtube link

Response: Good suggestion. The text now reads, “For additional information on using flexplot, visit the following YouTube playlist: https://bit.ly/2Qn4yoi.”