

List of changes

A very sincere thanks to the reviewers for their time and insightful comments! They have helped us to improve our work substantially. Thank you!

In the following we detail the actions taken on the items from your proposed changes.

The diff between the two versions can be found at <https://draftable.com/compare/BUaNYWmIaApr>

> - Fix all the low-level writing issues that were found by the reviewers.

Done.

> - Section 2.3: Explain R functions better

The section was rewritten to streamline the overview of eval in R including examples.

> - Section 2.4: Expand the discussion of Morandat et. al. and compare the contributions.

We added details about what exactly had been done in the work of Morandat et al and how it differs from our work.

> - Section 5.3: Improve provenance tracking results.

We designed a more thorough analysis of the origins of the expression passed to eval. It enables us to describe the origins of eval in more detail, at the granularity of functions, in Section 5.3. We also give a more complete high-level classification of the origins of eval.

> - Section 6: Do a major rewrite to provide a better accounting.

The section was completely rewritten. We have manually inspected the top 117 eval call sites that contribute to the 90% of the 49M recorded eval calls. From this batch we present a number of real-world use cases where eval is used. The goal of this section is to illustrate the variability of eval use in R.

> While the author response was not clear on how you will address the disconnect between the numbers you collected and the takeaway messages, this major rewrite should resolve this issue.

To address the disconnect, we have updated Section 4 and 5 with more information about the collected numbers and added Section 7 with additional discussion.

> - Add a discussion on the three sources provided in the response. If the
> analysis focuses on CRAN code only, you should de-emphasize the
> multiple-source arguments made in the paper.

The paper is indeed mostly about CRAN. We have updated the paper accordingly to make this clear and explained the reasons why we target CRAN.