**Summary of Changes**

The reviewers had two major problems with the paper, which were well summarized by the lead reviewer. The first problem was an unclear relationship with previous work; in particular with the Dax, EAVL, and PISTON work. The second problem was some issues with the performance studies.

The first revision of the paper did not adequately describe the relationship between the VTK-m software described by this paper with the research and development done for the Dax, EAVL, and PISTON projects. There is in fact a lineage from these other projects to VTK-m that was not explained in the first version. For this revision, we have added a sidebar that describes how Dax, EAVL, and PISTON are “predecessors” of VTK-m and how these previous works have contributed to the current software of VTK-m. The sidebar also serves as a quick reference for readers of the paper for this previous work and the citations for them. This description is also better explained throughout the text. In each section we describe the origin of each feature in VTK-m, its evolution, and how these various features are integrated together.

The reviewers also pointed out flaws in some of the results presented in the paper. In particular, the reviewers did not feel that we presented an adequate comparison of the two rendering techniques with other similar “known” algorithms. To correct this, we have added new measurements for these two sections. For the ray tracing section, we have replicated many of the experiments performed by Larsen et al. and compare the VTK-m implementation to the well established OptiX and Embree ray cast libraries in addition to a similar implementation in EAVL. For the volume rendering section, we have added a direct comparison to an often-used volume rendering algorithm available in VTK.