Below is the responses to the reviewer's comments (in blue):

- Please, do not put acronyms in the abstract.
- Please, put the acronyms from the introduction, always the first time they appear and if they are to be used again.
- Line 24: correct the degree symbol and define LOPS.
- Line 45: correct the degree symbol.

Thank you for pointing out our typo errors, we make corresponding corrections in the revised manuscript.

- _____
- Line 65-67: you refer to the errors of the three Euler angles. Have these errors been evaluated?

Thank you for the comments. We add descriptions to the Euler angles in the revised manuscript.

The Euler angles, which describe the transformation from the magnetometer frame to the star imager frame, are usually estimated in two ways [e.g. Olsen, 2003; Olsen et al., 2006]:

$$\boldsymbol{B}_{VFM} = \mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{T} \cdot \boldsymbol{B}_{NEC} = -\mathbf{R} \cdot \mathbf{T} \cdot \nabla V \tag{1}$$

Where B_{VFM} and B_{NEC} are the calibrated magnetic measurement in the magnetometer frame and geocentric frame, respectively. **R** and **T** are the transformation matrix determined by three Euler angles and attitude transformation matrix given by the Star Imager. In both of the ways, the estimation of the Euler angle requires both B_{VFM} and ∇V . However, due to the absence of the absolute magnetic

measurements, we could not determine the B_{VFM} directly. The information of the Euler angles are contained in the total compensation parameters K and b (see Equ. 16).

• Line 185: Please, can you add references on similar studies?

Previous studies have shown that the spacecraft stray field caused by static interference (DC field) or dynamic interferences could be detected and removed to be below the threshold of the scientific requirement by using a difference or gradient

We add related references in the revised manuscript. The references are already cited in the Introduction section.

method based on dual sensors measurements. [e.g. Zhang et al., 2006, 2007; Auster et al., 2008; Ludlam et al., 2008; Pope et al., 2011].

• Line 228-232: This section could be better explained, step by step, adding graphs that better explain the process and indicating its references.

Thank you for the comments. In the revised manuscript, we explain the process in more detail.

It is possible that the sawtooth signal is associated with the loading current of the satellite. The current system of the satellite is quite complex so that we do not analyse the current itself but diminish its effect mathematically and obtain a reasonable background magnetic field. At first, we obtain the low-frequency components (S_{spline})

by making a smoothing spline fitting to the original data series. After that, we extract the high-frequency signal (ΔS) by subtracting the low-frequency components from the original data series (S):

$$\Delta S = S - S_{spline} \tag{2}$$

The sawtooth signals are then contained in ΔS . The first order differences $(D_{\Delta S})$ of ΔS are calculated and divided into several segments with one segment about 100 data points. For each data segment of $D_{\Delta S}$, we determine the threshold above which we treat as outliers and set to be zero. The threshold is set empirically and varies from time to time but for most of the data, we set it to be a value below which there are 85% of the data points. We then obtain the calibrated high-frequency components by cumulative summation of the new first order difference (D_{CAL}) :

$$\Delta S_{CAL} = CumSum(D_{CAL}) \tag{3}$$

Finally, the calibrated data series are the summation of the calibrated-frequency components plus the low-frequency components.

• Line 285: References to Figure 16 and 17 appear before reference to Figure 15. Please, renumber the figures.

We renumber the Figures 16, 17 and Figure 15 in the revised manuscript.

Thank you very much With Best Regards Hao Luo Institute of Geology and Geophysics, Chinese Academy of Sciences P.O.Box 9825 Beijing 100029 P.R. China Email: luohao06@gmail.com