Comments to the authors:

Overall this is a well written summary of the WSSSPE workshop that provides information that is useful to the community, and also acts as a good introduction to the area.

Overall, I would recommend acceptance after minor revisions, as listed below.

Compulsory revisions:
- in the abstract, the use of the word "endpoint" is potentially confusion, given that the previous sentence talks about different kinds of endpoints. Plase change to an alternative word that implies time rather than location.

This has been changed

- In Section 2, could you add a breakdown of the geographical and domain/discipline spread of the accepted papers, along with a short sentence to comment on whether you think this is representative / indicative of the scientific software community and stakeholders.

This has been done

- In Section 4.4 could you add references to support and illuminate the discussion

This has been done

- In Section 4.5 it's not clear to me that GCC and Emacs are obvious examples to go with "having to ship tapes around" unless you meant the development of software like GCC and Emacs, which again is not clear or obvious given that GCC continues to be developed without tapes being shipped around.

This has been done

- minor typos in last paragraph in Section 6.1: "ore" -> "or"; remove extraneous comma after "4) Funders"

This has been done

Optional revisions:

- In Section 4.1, 4.2, 4.5 and 8 there is a sense of there being experience reports / case studies from software which has existed for differing lengths of time. Is there a way of highlighting which experience reports come from software projects that have been going for a "long" time (i.e. are sustainable) and also is there a sense at which time threshold you could consider a software project to have been going for a "long" time?

This has been done in two areas

- The wording of the sentence in Section 4.5 beginning "There was debate around people doing what interests them..." is clumsy

This has been fixed

- In section 8.1 first paragraph, would HUBZero rather than nanoHUB be a better example of generic computing frameworks?

This has been fixed

Please note that I have not cross-checked all the references.