15 July, 2024

Dear Editor,

We are submitting our second revision of our paper *"The* **nhppp** *package for simulating non-homogeneous Poisson point processes in* `R`*"* for your consideration for publication in *PLOS ONE*.

Per instructions, we have uploaded a tracked-changes version of the manuscript, where additions are in red font.

We have made edits to the manuscript to reply to the comments from this peer review round. Point to point replies to comments are listed in the Response Letter (uploaded separately). For this second round of the peer-review process, I observe that:

1. I have not received any clarifications on my questions about the Editors' comments from the first round of revisions. I, therefore, deduce that the Editor's comments from the first review round were due to a logistical mix up with another paper.

2. In the first review round, I asked the Editor and Reviewer 2 for clarifications on the comments by Reviewer 2, which were terse, unclear, nonspecific, and vague. I have received no replies. This impresses me as highly irregular. I claim that Reviewer 2 did not discharge his or her academic responsibilities satisfactorily in the first and second rounds of peer review. This Reviewer's lapses hinder me in discharging my own responsibilities as an author.

3. Reviewers 4 and 6 observe that the paper would also be appropriate for the `R` *Journal*. We opted to submit to *PLOS ONE* because our paper also includes a review of some theory and a numerical study. I believe that *PLOS ONE* is an appropriate place for the paper. Reviewer 6 also observes that *PLOS ONE* has published papers on *R packages*, which is accurate: I find at least 86 publications introducing `R` packages in *PLOS ONE*.[1]

4. Reviewer 5 recommends that we *"supplement the conclusion with quantitative results, particularly highlighting the advantages of their package over existing toolboxes, such as improvements in efficiency and accuracy, among other metrics."*

   Extensive quantitative analyses are presented in Sections 6 and 7 of the manuscript, and in Figures 2 through 7 and Tables 3 through 8. These sections include a detailed comparisons with all packages that include the ability to simulate from NHPPPs, and document that some of the packages simulate only approximately. Please advise.

Because of these observations, I ask that the complete peer review record for this submission be made publicly available to the fullest extent allowed by the Journal.

As described in the manuscript, a preprint of this work was submitted to `arXiv`,[2] the package

[1] Based on the PubMed query `PLOS ONE[so] AND "R package"[ti]` on July 15, 2024.

[2] The preprint is uploaded as a 'Related Manuscript', per submission instructions

is on the Comprehensive R Archive Network, and its code is in a publicly accessible GitHub repository.

No part of this manuscript is considered for peer review and publication elsewhere.

We hope that the six reviewers and you will deem the manuscript worthy of publication.

Regards,

TA Trikalinos