

## ***Interactive comment on “The infrastructure MESSy submodels GRID (v1.0) and IMPORT (v1.0)” by A. Kerkweg and P. Jöckel***

**A. Kerkweg and P. Jöckel**

kerkweg@uni-mainz.de

Received and published: 21 January 2016

Dear Editor, dear Referees,

in the following we like to comment on the Editors comment:

**I first want to thank the two reviewers for their work. The authors have made substantial editing in their second version, and I’am asking a further review.**

Obviously, we had to substantially change the manuscript according to the reviewer comments. Not least, we took considerable efforts to explain to what extent the presented model developments are of interest for users outside the MESSy community.

C3771

We think the manuscript considerably improved and therefore are grateful for the helpful suggestions of the referees. Now we are looking forward to the outcome of the re-review.

**Maybe I could comment some items of the authors’ response to reviewers. Authors write that “GMD is not about scientific content”. This is not fully true, as lot of GMD papers have a meaningful scientific content. However, documenting models and software tools fits the scope of GMD. So the present scope of the paper seems ok for GMD.**

We completely agree and we are sorry, that we skipped the words “not necessarily”. What we meant is indeed, that GMD is not necessarily about publishing scientifically new results only.

**Nevertheless, a GMD paper is not a model or software documentation, as the full documentation is added as supplement. To determine what is of general interest to all readers and must be included in the article, and what is more specific to MESSy users and must remain in the attached documentation, is somewhat tricky. I suggest the authors to consider the comments of reviewers, before taking their own decision.**

As stated above, we tried our best. But indeed the referees should be convinced. We are open for further arguments.

Best regards,  
A. Kerkweg and P. Jöckel

C3772