

We would like to thank the Editor and the reviewer for their appreciation of our work and their insightful comments on the manuscript. We prepared a carefully revised version taking into account all the comments and issues raised.

Below, we reply to the remarks and recommendations of the report, point by point, and indicate the relevant changes made in the revised version.

We hope that the Editor and the reviewer will find the revised version of our paper suitable for publication in The R journal.

**>Reply to Referee's Report number 2**

We would like to thank you for your constructive comments, recommendations and helpful suggestions. In the following, we provide a point-by-point response to your remarks and suggestions.

**>In my previous review, I expressed the opinion that “while the package is already at a mature stage of development and does not require major changes, the article requires some substantial rewriting and additions to make it clearer and more readable”. I am happy to see that the authors have indeed done a substantial work of rewriting, and I believe that this has resulted in a clearer exposition of the methodology behind Robin.**

**>Overall, I am satisfied by the answers given by the authors. I only have a few minor comments, which the authors may wish to address before finalizing the manuscript.**

**>Minor comments:**

**>In my opinion, the use of punctuation throughout the article could be improved. I feel that comma are often misplaced, and sometimes this makes sentences hard / annoying to read. I will give here an example (among many) of this: “In the study of complex networks, a network is said to have community structure, if the nodes are densely connected within groups but sparsely connected between them”. The second comma should be removed**

**>In the list of steps for the first and second workflow (pp. 3 and 4) I think using the infinitive form would be preferable (e.g., find instead of finds)**

**>Page 6, right after eq. (6): robin uses instead of robin used**

Thanks for your suggestions.

We carefully read the paper and corrected the use of punctuation and language.

**>Could the list of clustering algorithms implemented in igraph be presented more shortly? It feels a bit cumbersome to read, specially considering that it is a detailed explanation of algorithms implemented in another R package.**

Thanks for pointing this out. We simplified the presentation following the classification presented in S. Fortunato. Community detection in graphs. *Physics reports*, 486(3–5):75–174, 2009

**>Tables 3 and 4: are all those digits really necessary?**

We formatted the tables displaying only 2/3 decimal places.