Dear authors,

I checked the authors appropriately addressed all items raised by the referee #2 except following 2 items.

(1) For the following referee's comment.

> 20. 5.5. The sentence is unintelligible. Moreover, the explanation of how parameter ranges (i.e. priors - why don't you call them priors) are derived is not sufficient. Provide a clear rationale for prior elicitation.

Authors replied as follows.

> Parameter ranges are not priors. This is explained at the beginning of this document.

But I could not find corresponding explanation on the manuscript.

(2) On the last item from the referee#2, authors replied as follows.

> The code is under MPI-M License agreement and we cannot distribute it. The driving data (approximately 500Mb) and chains can be uploaded e.g. as supplements.

For ensuring computational reproducibility, driving data, at least, should be available on an appropriate repository, which is reasonably accessible for readers.

Best,
Hisashi SATO