Dear Editor,

I have made the additional updates in reply to the suggestions by the second reviewer. It only deviates from the request in the sense that it only gives a limited set of pointers regarding citation network analysis, which is outside the scope of this work in my opinion. For a complete LaTeX diff, see the attachment.

Changes:

> *The Background section has now a different content than before, partly copied from other places of the previous manuscript, but it is still not a proper background section. It is very technical and very narrow, and thereby fails to give a general and broad overview of this research field. Specifically, this comment from my previous review still holds: "I expected to read something about other work on analyzing citation networks, on the usage and impact of reference managers, on the properties and uptake of ontologies on scholarly communication, just to mention a few examples from the top of my head."*

We thank the reviewer for his comments and we made a few additional general references. However, we believe all the relevant topics have been covered, and this paper is not a review paper. We added more information and citations on reference managers and the distinction between references and citations (commit, line 26–29 and 45–53). Several ontologies and vocabularies were already mentioned, but the BIBO may be of further interest and is mentioned too now. The topic of citation networks is in our opinion outside the scope of this paper. However, we added a reference to relevant literature (commit).

> *As with the Background, also the Approach section lacks a high-level description. The content is all very low-level and technical, which is OK for such an Approach section, but only if preceded by a high-level introduction and explanation. The Approach section start with pointing out what version control system was used, instead of introducing the high-level Citation.js approach.*

A high-level introduction to the approach was added (commit, line 103–119).

> *I like the addition of the accuracy reports in the Results section. This really strengthens the paper!*

Thank you!

> *However, "accuracy" is highly confusing as a term, both intuitively and technically (because of its very specific meaning in statistics). Reporting accuracy levels of 27% makes your tool look performing very poorly when the common interpretation of "accuracy" is applied. I suggest to rename "accuracy" with a more appropriate term, e.g. "coverage". Moreover, the text could make it a bit clearer to what extent these*

numbers come from a lack of expressiveness of the studied formats or a lack of implemented features on the side of Citation.js (I think it's already in the text to an extent but I found it difficult to understand).

The term "accuracy" has been replaced with "coverage", and the section has been rewritten into a more logical process of though ([commit](#), line 263–301).

> *The designs of the evaluations presented in the Results section should moreover be introduced better (either in a previous section such as Approach, or before the actual results are described in Results). Now, these designs are only described implicitly together with the results. It is good style to separate the two when describing evaluations, i.e. first describing the evaluation's design and only then its results.*

A new section "Evaluation" has been added at the end of the Approach section ([commit](#) and [commit](#), line 238–261).

> *I like Figure 1! But it's a bit unclear which parts make up the Citation.js tool (all the arrows? only the arrow pointing from "Input" to "Output"?)*

Citation.js is represented by all the arrows, this has been clarified in the figure ([commit](#)).

> *I like the addition of Impact in the Results section! I think it would help further if Figure 5 was quickly summarized in a sentence (like "Overall, our package was downloaded X times since its creation in October 2016").*

This has been added ([commit](#), line 305–306).

A few minor additional edits have been included. First, since the last revision an archived but authoritative description of RIS has been found in the Internet Archive. Second, the disc tool that was mentioned is now properly cited.

With these changes, I believe to have addressed the remaining points from the second reviewer,

with kind regards,

Lars