The paper presents an interesting comparison of Green Driving and U-SAVE software packages, aimed at informing consumers about the CO2e/GHG impact of their car travel decisions. While the topic is relevant/valuable and the idea welcome, the paper needs to clarify its contribution and role in policy and practice.

We thank the reviewer for the positive reaction to our submission. We tried to take on board all comments and amend the paper accordingly.

Some literature supporting the approach is needed and justification for the experimental conditions (choice of roads or O-D, location, choice of devices and monitoring schedule, etc.).

We cited appropriate reports. We readjusted the phrase containing it to make it clearer.

But the main let down is the discussion.

*The paper does not answer the question: "So what?" What are the planners/modelers, legislators, software developers, communities at large going to do with these results? The paper seems to have died after presenting the results, which is unfortunate, but I believe it can be revived.

Thank you for your comment. The conclusion has been revised and expanded as suggested by the reviewer. The additions were made also in various points across the document and are quite extensive to list here.

Some specific comments follow, in the same order they appear in the paper.

*Figure 2 is redundant, given that the information is already given in Table 1.
Thank you for your comment. We do not agree that the figure is redundant, as we believe Figure 2 gives a nice and easy to grasp an overview of the concept behind the analysis we performed. We decided to keep the figure.

*The most fuel-efficient path is not always the shortest path, given the geometry of the road, traffic conditions/the emission-speed profile. Please elaborate or amend as required.

The most fuel-efficient path is not always the shortest path, because the real fuel consumption does not depend only on the length of the road traveled, but it is a more complex function of also other parameters, such as the geometry of the road and traffic conditions. The geometry of the road (number and type of curves; the slope of the road) and the traffic conditions (start and stop situation leading to idle-fuel consumptions; sudden braking) affect the instantaneous operating conditions of the vehicle and as a consequence the instantaneous fuel consumption. As a consequence, a longer but less busy/steep route could be more fuel-efficient than a more busy/steep one, between two given O-D points.

*Tables 3 and 4 suggest systematic underestimation by U-SAVE, which can be improved with specific inputs and quite an uncertain result/lower precision for Green Driving, even when conditions are specified in great detail. Whereas this is described/repeated on pp.7-9, there is no conclusion/recommendation per se. The lower sensitivity of Green Driving in matching the CO2 trend over short-segments of the trip and overall acceptable trip results calls for further discussion, considering the distribution of trip length for a city. On the other hand, U-SAVE appears to capture more accurately the CO2 emissions profile, but it requires more specific data, which comes at a cost. It is an expectation that these aspects are discussed at length, rather than merely reporting results and repeating them in the Discussion and Conclusion sections.

More discussion in the result section has been added as suggested by the reviewer. We have marked the additions in red color for the convenience of the reviewer.

*References need special attention as the papers in the list miss their titles (e.g., Ahn and Rakha, 2008, 2013; Walnum and Simonsen, 2015; Zheng et al., 2017; Fontaras et al., 2018 – just to name the first four). Matlab Toolbox and Lophaven et al. (2002) are included on the same reference line.
Also, the citation style is inconsistent. Please attend to this matter.

This was a Zotero issue and it has been corrected as suggested by the reviewer.

*There are some language problems as well (typos, grammar, unusual constructions). Please, proof-edit the whole paper and consider replacing: 'Draw attention' instead of "raise effect", 'As already indicated' instead of "As mention in the introduction", 'standard deviations' instead of "standards deviation", etc.

The paper was proof checked by an experienced author. We hope to have corrected all relevant issues.

*A cross-reference is broken on p.10 ("Error! Reference source not found")

The broken reference has been fixed.