

Thanks for the modifications based on the first round of review comments.

In this round of view, I'd like to give some specific comments regarding these modifications, as follows:

1. Regarding the modifications for the first comment from the first round of review, some failure cases in pointing validation should be given.
2. Regarding the modifications for the fourth comment from the first round of review, I do not fully agree that "in practice none of the realistic changes suggested by climate scientists and software engineers resulted in a discrepancy between CAM-ECT and UF-CAM-ECT". It is true that the changes in model code or computing environment can introduce changes to most of grid cells in model cases, but my example that "scientists may only change the land surface data of several grid points when simulating the atmosphere for some scientific researches, or changing a few ocean grid cells into land grid cells in coupled climate model simulations" truly happens in our model development. I think the reason for such kind of discrepancy between CAM-ECT and UF-CAM-ECT is because UF-CAM-ECT uses globally averaged result while 9 steps are not enough to propagate local errors to the whole grid. So I guess that such kind of discrepancy can be solved when not only using the globally averaged results. If the authors agree, discussions or even update in UF-CAM-ECT should be made.
3. Regarding the modifications for the fifth comment from the first round of review, the authors should give related results in the paper, especially when these examples are already available.