To whom it may concern:

Editor

1. We have added the name of the package to the paper title, and hopefully made it clearer that the package is intended for descriptive analysis.
2. Example code has been added to the manuscript although not in great detail. The package documentation and new-user guide provide more information, and the raw code can be viewed by downloading the package.
3. We have added references for Tukey and Loess smoothing.
4. Font size and type are the same for all figures generated by our package, but we are not able to change the proprietary software fonts or alter our package’s output to match them.

Reviewer 1

1. We are currently working on a GUI using R Shiny, but it will likely not be ready in time for this publication. This is now included in the text.
2. Editor said to ignore.
3. Editor also said to ignore.
4. I think we can ignore this as well, although I’m **still confused about the editor’s note about making figure legends legible**.

Reviewer 2

1. See response to editor, #2.
2. Package name has been added to manuscript title and abstract.
3. Hopefully this is clearer now, but we could **maybe add another sentence somewhere.**
4. See response to editor, #3.
5. Editor said to ignore.

Questions

1. Is it okay to ignore reviewer 1 #3 per the editor’s instructions?
2. Editor says to make figure legends legible, reviewer 1 says they aren’t showing up properly, but they look good to me. Do they mean the axes labels?
3. How to format code in the paper?
4. Can we hyperlink github, figshare, etc.? Long links look bad.