We thank you for the amazingly speedy review of our submission, and the time and efforts you have invested in the review.

Code

> library(bulletxtrctr) is not available on CRAN, and no instructions are given for compiling. It is needed for bullet_to_land_predict() later in the code. Technically, the requirement that the package is on CRAN also means that all the dependent packages are also on CRAN. Is there a reason for bulletxtrctr not to be on CRAN? If so, then your example code for cmpsR will need to be independent of bulletxtrctr.

`bulletxtrctr` is a suggestion for the `cmpsR` package but not a strict dependency. We have removed this dependency from the paper so that `bulletxtrctr` is no longer needed for compiling. We are using `bulletxtrctr` as part of the pipeline of extracting the 2D information from the 3D scans in the reproducible codes. We intend to publish `bulletxtrctr` on CRAN eventually, but Dr. Hofmann tells me that at the moment it is a bit of a mess.

> source("../code/func_collection.R") points to a non-existing directory
>
> This function compute_var_ratio_anova() isn't found.

Thank you for pointing this out. This was a careless mistake and has been fixed. `../code/func_collection.R` is not needed for the paper. `compute_var_ratio_anova()` should really be `cmpsR::compute_ss_ratio()` and is part of the `cmpsR` package. We have changed the occurrence in the paper accordingly.

Paper

> If the paper was written in Rmarkdown please submit the .Rmd file too. My recommendation is for you to follow the format provided in the (new) rjtools package (https://rjournal.github.io/rjtools/), when writing with Rmarkdown. (You should probably remove the extra lines referring to knitr options from the .R file after using curl to extract code from the Rmd.) (More details on this format are provided on the dev version of the R Journal site, which will become the primary web site from the next issue: https://journal.r-project.org/dev/submissions.html .)

Yes, the paper was written in Rmarkdown, and the `.Rmd` file has been included in the re-submission.

The extra lines referring to knitr options from the `.R` file are removed.

To address the requirements described on the dev version of the R Journal site, all the R scripts in the `reproducible` folder of the original submission has been zipped into `supplementary-files.zip`, and the data contained in the `reproducible` folder has been made available on an alternative site with the link provided in the paper under the section "Supplementary materials" to reduce the size of the submission file.

> Please don't have URLs randomly in the text: "Our implementation is made available as part of the R package cmpsR on GitHub at https://github.com/willju-wangqian/ cmpsR." You should be referring to the CRAN version, and development version on github, and these would be listed in a section titled "Supplementary materials" after the Conclusions section.

We have added the "Supplementary materials" section after the Conclusions section. And the URLs are removed from the paper.

> Sentences like "(We have asked the authors of Chen et al. (2019), and we are still waiting for the replies.)" should be omitted from the paper.

This sentence has been removed from the paper.

The paper is nicely written and the plots are easy to read.

Thank you so much! This means a lot!