Response to reviewers:

YOUR TITLE

YOUR PAPER ID

March 25, 2023

Dear Editor,

First of all, we would like to thank you and the reviewers for the time and effort that you have put into providing us with this detailed, valuable, and in-depth feedback.

All reviewer comments . . .

We hope you find the new version of the manuscript to your satisfaction and look forward to any further feedback you may provide.

Best regards,

YOUR NAME

Rev2.1

Comment: While most of the suggestions on how to address the identified issues have been followed sufficiently well, the suggested improvement 1.2 has not been implemented as recommended: "list all 34 identified specific guidelines for code review of artifacts as answer to RQ1, not only the nine guideline categories currently shown in Table 3. (RQ1 = What are the guidelines, from white and gray literature, for source and test artifact review?) Basically, Table 3 should be at the level of detail provided by Table 4."

- -

Response: The reviewer emphasized that the switch of Tables 3 and 4 would improve the paper, and we now see the benefits to the reading flow if the tables are switched.

Rev3.1

Comment: all figures and tables need to mention in text

- -

Response: We agree with the reviewer that all figures and tables should be mentioned in the text, but we could not identify a missing reference to a table or figure. The figures and tables are mentioned in the text as follows:
- Figure 1 on page 8
- Figure 2 on page 13
- Table 1 on pages 8 and 9
- Table 2 on pages 9 and 10
- Table 3 on pages 12, 14, and 16
- Table 4 on page 16