

Answers to Reviewer comments:

“The paper is improved from its previous version, but still has a couple of flaws: a) the English needs a thorough scrub (unfortunately I apologize that I lack the time);”

The English have been revised.

“b) the circularity of CRUST1.0 in comparison to the gravity, when CRUST1.0 uses gravity as an input. The authors argue that CRUST1.0 uses airborne gravity while they use satellite gravity, but the issue is not resolution: its that the assumptions about density are the same. “

CRUST 1 use gravity observations to estimate crustal thickness only as a input where active source seismic and receiver functions studies are missing (see Laske et al. 2013). The gravity data used in CRUST1.0 from the airborne observations have not a homogenous coverage and accuracy than in the case of satellite observations of GOCE used for computing our model.

“Given that, I think it is too strong to say that CRUST1.0 has been validated by this product (page 11, lines 19-20). I recommend removing that statement.”

We have removed the statement “We conclude that the AN1 seismic crustal model is not validated by gravity models contrary to CRUST1.0”