

**Table 3: Answers to Questions C2 and C3**

<b>Interviewee</b>	<b>Answer to C2</b>	<b>Answer to C3</b>
I1	Yes	Yes
I2	Yes	No
I3	Yes	Not all
I4	Yes	Yes
I5	Yes	No
I6	Yes	Not all
I7	Yes	Yes

Table 3 presents the summarized answers for the questions **C2** and **C3** for each interviewee. We can see that all interviewees answered “Yes” for question **C2**, and there were three “Yes”, two “No”, and two “Not all” for question **C3**. The answer “Not all” was not literal in the answers from interviewees **I3** and **I6**, but was summarized in this way for a better overview in the table.

**Table 4: Answers to Question C4 and Follow-Up Questions**

<b>Part.</b>	<b>Answer to C4</b>	<b>Tool Name(s)</b>	<b>Detection on...</b>
I1	Yes	Language-specific linters like GOLANGCI-LINT	Produced code
I2	Yes	ESLINT	Produced code
I3	No	N/A	N/A
I4	Yes	STYLELINT plugins	Produced code
I5	No	N/A	N/A
I6	Yes	SONARQUBE, SONARLINT	Produced code, maintained code
I7	Yes/No	Unknown	Produced code

Table 4 presents the tools the interviewees said they use in their projects and at which development stage these tools are used. Interviewee **17** informed that the tool their team use to detect code smells is developed by their company and only available there, not being publicly available. They also informed that their team uses another public library to detect code smells and detect vulnerabilities while building their project, but they did not remember the name at the time, thus we attributed their answer as “Unknown”. We can see that, from all interviewees that said that they use detection tools in their project, all of them use the tools in their produced code, during the development stage.