Dear Editors and Reviewers,

Thank you for the opportunity to address questions regarding our paper. We address the reviewers’ comments below in italics.

**Reviewer 1:** In this brief article, the authors reported an R package (cgmanalysis: Clean and Analyze Continuous Glucose Monitor Data) for analyzing data from continuous glucose monitor (CGM). The cgmanalysis package aims to provide an open-source solution to CGM data analysis and management. The functions implemented for this package are fairly straightforward. Below are my comments.

1. As the authors noted, the lack of a graphical user interface (GUI) may hinder the adoption of the developed functions. Since the functions are developed in R, the authors can consider building an R shiny app (<https://shiny.rstudio.com/>) as a simple user interface.

*We agree with the reviewer that an R Shiny app is a simple way to create a user interface. We have begun writing a Shiny app, although it will likely not be fully functional in time for this publication.*

2. The authors should consider comparing the functionalities provided by existing proprietary software for CGM visualization and analyses (such as iPro 2, Carelink 670G, Dexcom, Diasend) and those implemented in cgmanalysis in the Discussion section.

*We have not moved the comparisons to the discussion section, per the editor’s comments.*  
  
3. In the current Figures 4a-4d, the scale of Tukey AGP and those of other proprietary software were different, making the visual comparison difficult.

*We have not altered the figure scales, per the editor’s comments.*  
  
4. The figure legend for interquartile range (blue) in Figures 1 and 4a-4d were not showing up properly.

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.