We would like to thank the reviewer for his time and constructive feedback. We believe the current content of the paper is now clarified from the point of few items the reviewer suggested. Below we added our responses to reviewer's detailed comments in bold.

The paper gives an extensive description of the scientific activities of ICGEM. The paper is unusually long but I think that its length is adequate to fully and properly describe the services provided by ICGEM. Also, the paper is well organised and written in a good English language. I only have some minor comments on the paper that are listed below.

In the revised version, we tried to reduce the size of the paper in some sections as recommended by the other two reviewers to focus on the more important items. To keep the size of the entire paper smaller, we also removed some of the Appendices that included the list of the models. Considering the size of the figures in general, we hope the professional editing from the journal would help the readers to follow the paper easily.

- page 9, 15: the discussion on the terms "gravitational" and "gravity" is quite misleading. I don't agree with the authors' statement, i.e. to use "gravity" instead of "gravitational". I think that we must stay strictly in the geodetic tradition and use properly the two terms throughout the paper.

This topic on the terminology has been discussed also among the authors and indeed we agree that we should stick with the correct terminology and be consistent. For the purpose of this paper, the clarification was clearly made from the point of the difference between the two to prevent any confusion. The terminology used through paper that is related to the coefficients of the models provided would refer to "gravitational". For the rest of the paper, we paid more attention to be consistent and correct with the use of the "gravity" and "gravitational". Thank you for noting this very important item.

- page 10, 10-15: this comment connects to the previous one. The authors stated that "gravity" has to be used and then they write "Geodesy describes the gravitational potential only in empty space,...". This is not in the line that they stated. So, again, I would ask the authors to stick to the standard notation of Geodesy, which is clear, without contradiction and used for many years.

In the revised version, we have changed at few places gravity into gravitational for the correct use of the terminology and consistency. Thank you for paying attention to this point.

- page 10: it is frequently used the sentence "real gravity field". I would use "gravity field" only

This is to prevent the confusion between the model approximations to the gravity field and the actual gravity field itself. One can use "true gravity field" instead as well. Since gravity field is repeated many times, we would like to distinguish them by using "real".

- page 11, Eq. (8): Pnm is normalised so it should have the bar on top.

Added.

- page 13, before Eq. (10): "and valid in space". I would write "in space"

Replaced.

- page 17, 10: "physical heights". I would add "physical heights (i.e. orthometric heights)"

Added as suggested.

-page 23, 20-25. I would skip the sentence "(ellipsoidal equipotential...over the oceans)" which could be misleading

The sentence starting with "The defining parameters.." has been removed for clarity.

- page 29, 15: instead of "different models quickly" write "different models" because "quickly" is written in the same line.

Indeed, it is edited in the revised version.

- page 32, Eq. (13): please replace "s" withe the greek letter sigma to be coherent with the statement above

This was due to the conversion to pdf, in the revised version it is paid attention to represent it correctly.