

Dear referees,

Thank you for your review and comments. They have been well noted and we have addressed them as follows:

Reviewer 1

1. Regarding details of the Origin-Destination matrix: we have added clarification in the first 2 paragraphs of Section 2.2 to state that the indicators were calculated on a daily basis. We have also included a citation of the suggested reference, to refer the reader to a source where they can obtain more technical details.
2. Regarding the representativeness/biases inherent in the dataset: details about geographical market share and customer penetration constitute sensitive commercial information to a telecommunications operator. The telecommunications operator that have provided the data are not comfortable with the open publication of such sensitive details (a common sentiment amongst telecommunications operators). Therefore, we are not able to include such details in the article. It was also our intent to focus on the policy aspects of the project, rather than the scientific or technical details (e.g. a detailed discussion of the biases inherent in the data), as this is not intended to be a technical paper.
3. The data were not made available publicly because of the constraints of the partnership agreement. The data are privately owned by the telecommunications operator, and therefore it is their decision as to what data is shared, and with whom. They are not yet comfortable with openly sharing aggregated data, although this may be a possibility later on. In the original manuscript, we did include a Data Availability Statement which explains how interested parties can gain access to the aggregated dataset. So although the data are not published publicly, parties outside of the collaboration can access the aggregated dataset by submitting an application to the project partners. However, since many readers may not read as far as this statement, we have included a similar statement at the end of Section 3 as well.

Reviewer 2

In the "Lessons learned" section, we tried to articulate as many details as we felt would be applicable and understandable to the audience. Any further details are very context-dependent or are very technical in nature. However, as you rightly state, guidance about setting up these kinds of initiatives is rare, and difficult to find. In general, it is partly because the context has a lot of influence over the implementation and the practical details, and therefore a case study from one single project may provide some good general guiding principles, but not practical, actionable details. However, there are initiatives to change this, and we have therefore added a reference to the GPSDD's final report on 'Unlocking Privately Held Data for Public Good' at the end of Section 4.1. This reference includes information that is highly relevant to projects involving mobile phone data, and is quite a comprehensive resource which may contain some of the guidance that yourself and other actors are seeking. We have also taken on board your

recommendation to write another brief, with more details of our learnings, and will incorporate this into our planned future activities.

Please let us know if you have any further comments after reviewing the revised manuscript, as we will be happy to make further improvements.

Yours faithfully,

Tracey Li
(On behalf of the authorship team)