Letter to the Topical Editor

Dear Ignacio Pisso,

Thank you so much for your quick response, and the details on how to get to a finalized manuscript. We sincerely hope that it can be published soon now, before our software goes into release 6 and we can start with adapting the paper all over again.

In detail, here is our response to the corrections you listed:

L59
both software package can be seen as natural
-> both software packages can be seen as natural → done

L66
"and have implemented first steps towards integrating full MESSy support into ESM-Tools, hoping to complete this process by release 5.0 (planned for October 2020)." This paper is supposed to already describe v5.0 now. → removed the date, as not much interest is shown in MESSy support at the moment.

L108:
The ESM-Tools software is devided into three major parts
-> The ESM-Tools software is divided into three major parts
This was pointed out by the reviewer but not modified. → Done, sorry about that.

L172:
We separated our (Python)
I think the issue is to use present and not past tense → Still don't see what's the point, but changed to present.

2.2.1 has lost a whole paragraph while the corrections by rev 1 are marked as done. Was intentional? → Yes, as the reviews were quite extensive, we reworked that part to make it more concise, and better focused on out tools, rather than Python features.

From reviewer #1
> P16L342 (in version 3 of the manuscript): 'configuration'; is Done but 'As an example, ...' is not Done.
(in version 4: ...'the model. An an example, in Fig. 9,...') → Corrected that

Please correct the alignment of appendix subsections with the corresponding figures.
A1 Example ESM-Tools runscript
A2 Example YAML configuration file → changed the width of one figure and introduced a couple of newpage commands to make them fit nicely

I hope that now, finally, we have met all requirements for publication,

Best regards,
Dirk Barbi for the ESM-Tools team