

1 The authors would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their considerate feed-
2 back on our manuscript and the acceptance of our manuscript for publication.

3 We also notice a mistake in the title for the version of the ECHAM-HAMMOZ,
4 which should read ECHAM6.30-HAM2.3-MOZ1.0 instead of ECHAM30-HAM2.3-
5 MOZ1.0.

6 **Responses:**

7 1. Line 129: the definition of the horizontal divergence is incorrect. Note that di-
8 vergence is not a vector as defined here, and the second term of the divergence
9 operator needs to have an added $\cos(\phi)$ term in the numerator: $(v \cos(\phi))$.
10 Since the divergence is actually never used in the following equations, I suggest
11 just leaving it out.

12 **Answer:** It was a mistake. We removed the equation.

13 2. Line 120 onwards: It seems that the current notation with the density ρ implic-
14 itly assumes (for the purpose of the analysis) that the tracer mixing ratio is 1 (as
15 defined in line 109) and that the flow is non-divergent, as it was done in Lin and
16 Rood (MWR, 1996) for the FFSL scheme. Clarify whether the non-divergent
17 flow condition is assumed here.

18 **Answer:** We added the non-divergent flow condition for the advective operator
19 in line 125, which is used to preserve the consistency condition as done in Lin
20 and Rood (MWR, 1996).

21 3. Line 192: the subscript 'a' in the symbol ϕ_a is undefined. Add a definition.

22 **Answer:** Done.

23 4. Figs. (22)-(24): The authors switched to a different color scheme which is ap-
24 preciated. However, it is obvious that the colors saturate and the range of values
25 in the simulation is not captured. In addition, discrete colors are a better choice
26 (as in the earlier version of the manuscript) instead of the new gliding color
27 scheme. The most adequate color scheme here would use non-equidistant spac-
28 ings that are tailored to the simulation data. Overall, the current plots convey the
29 main message that the AMR grid captures certain regions, therefore changing
30 the colors again is not a must-do correction. It would be a nice-to-have enhance-
31 ment/improvement of these figures.

32 **Answer:** Thank you for the kind suggestion. We decide to leave it as it is.