**Comments from the editors and reviewers:**  
-**Reviewer 1**

This is a timely paper that will be of interest not only to practitioners in the field, but to funding agencies/government, and researchers in general.

This was a clean and well-organized manuscript. I offer the following suggestions which may help to improve it in a few places.

1. Starting on page 4 you use the term "community of practice." Although it is defined in the reference, the term is used a few more times in the paper, so perhaps a succinct definition?

﻿We thank the reviewer for this suggestion.

We added the following definition in page 4:

A community of practice is a group of people who share some expertise in a specific field or common interest, and who learn from each other through information sharing [1].

[1] J. Lave, E. Wenger, Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

2. Pg 7: Suggest you define XSEDE as NSF-funded HPC infrastructure. With all the acronyms, every bit helps.

Thanks for the suggestion – we now introduce d XSEDE and added a reference to the project as follows:

﻿XSEDE (a high performance computing infrastructure project funded by the US National Science Founcation [1])

[1] Extreme Science and Engineering Discovery Environment, n.d. URL: https://www.xsede.org/, [Accessed: 28 Oct 2018].

3. Pg 9: In the paragraph starting on line 208 you mention the benefits of globally distributed, internet-accessible infrastructure, including for Africa. Does not \*have to\* be addressed here, but internet accessibility in Sub-Saharan Africa (excepting perhaps SA) is still a challenge. I think groups like H3 Africa BioNet have opted for different, local solutions. Maybe a mention?

Suggestion: do not change this.

We agree with the reviewer that looking into alternatives would be interesting and useful. We however consider this topic outside of the ambition of our current work, and will take in into account in a follow-up paper.

4. From page 8-14 it seems like many of the paragraphs could be grouped into subheadings in this section (e.g. 'Open source', 'Linking infrastructure', 'Standards', etc.). May help readability, and i don't know if it may prompt authors to tweak how the content is organized.

Thanks for the suggestion. We sorted the text into paragraphs ﻿for the following themes: lowering barriers to e-infrastructures, enabling collaboration between (remote) researchers, sharing and linking infrastructure resources, driving standards and Open Science, and supporting teaching and new career developments. The text itself has not been changed.

5. Pg 11: Line 261 - COS should be the American English Center for Open Science

We thank the reviewer for this remark, however we could not fully understand it. We mean to refer to the Center for Open Science (<https://cos.io/>), which has no reference to ‘American English’ in their website. We therefore left the reference to COS as Center for Open Science.

6. It occurs to me that section 5 (Pg 14) might actually open with the content in the paragraph starting on Pg 15 line 373. I think most people close to the subject find measuring impact to be one of more difficult challenges. For less familiar readers, presenting this more explicitly might better frame the content in this section.

Thanks for this suggestion. We have included this sentence to introduce section 5:

﻿Science gateways have diverse goals, diverse user communities and diverse measures of success. But in all cases, measurement and characterization of impact is of fundamental importance.

-**Reviewer 2**  
  
  - Overall a good overview of recent efforts, although it does make me wonder if a more comprehensive list of key platforms/initiatives would be feasible as a follow-up?

1. Section 3 discusses existing programs, and provides funding for some, but not all. If feasible I would suggest adding information on funding levels for all. Likewise, if the user activity listed for Nectar was available for the others that would also be useful.

As we do not have the data, I don't think this is feasible. Certainly, would not fall into ‘minor’ revision, because it would ask more data collection.

Suggestion: add one sentence 3.1 saying that the levels of funding and characteristics of these programs are very diverse, which makes it difficult to harmonize the presentation, so these should be taken as illustrations rather than a complete and systematic overview.

1. Line 150, replace "form" with "provide".
2. Line 222 - delete 2nd "Apache".
3. Line 240 - add hyphen before "related".
4. Line 248 - delete "open".
5. Line 270 - replace "develop" with "tailor".
6. Line 417 - replace "to rely" with "a reliance".

Thanks for the suggestions, all changes have been applied in the revised manuscript.

-**Reviewer 3**  
  
  - This manuscript provides a comprehensive overview of current Virtual Research Environment and Science Gateway infrastructure.

The article is deliberately broad to encompass all aspects of the Science Gateways. In future articles, it would be useful to contrast this analysis to other research and development activities occurring outside of publicly funded research institutes and organisations. Are, VRE's used in commercial companies with large research and development operations (e.g. pharmaceutical, manufacturing. material design, information technology development).

This could be approached in follow-up article

Additional analysis on outcomes and impact areas from an international perspective would also be useful. The article references some initiatives designed to increase adoption, utilisation and sharing of research infrastructure global but does not reference the Global Impact of these infrastructures. Further discussion on implicit or explicit impact would be useful.

Silvia: I think we need to react to this one. We do refer to impact on section 5, but apparently the reviewer does not think it is sufficient. I will check how to emphasize this

Some specific comments regarding the article include:

* Figure 1 - Utilisation Graph - would be useful to have some explanation to why there was an increase in mention of VRE's in 2008 and then a fall.
* Also, is it unclear what has caused the decrease in presentations in Australia. Is this funding or no accurate reporting for those periods?

I think we should add a few lines to the paper to discuss:

* why no USA activity in 2012
* why so much activity in EU in 2013? Was it SCI-BUS the cause for such large participation?
* Why no activity in AU in 2018
* VRE in open source environments with active code development -  [33] and Galaxy [34], Drupal [35] and Django [36]. Suggest removing Drupal and Django due to their common usage outside of the VRE.

What do you think? I tend to agree that Drupal and Django are broader scoped than science gateways. What I do not know is if science gateways in some way are influencing these platforms somehow.