

## Responses to Topical Editor comments

January 13, 2022

(Original comments in plain text below; our responses in **bold**)

Based on the positive reviews and your responses to them, I am happy to recommend your paper for publication, pending a couple small questions of my own on your changes to the manuscript in response to the referees' comments. Line numbers are from the tracked-changes version.

**We thank the topical editor for catching these! We have made edits to the relevant lines as noted.**

Line 245: I am not sure that you meant to use the word "code" before the parentheses; this seems in response to the referee comment about reproducibility (vs. transparency, as you note) in which the referee noted that an executable would suffice for reproducibility.

**Changed to "... requires shared digital files (either executable binary files or source code; ideally the latter so that the algorithms are transparent)"**

Line 635: "failures Jupyter" – it seems that a sentence transition was lost during the editing process.

**Changed to "... run-time errors in ..."**

Line 676: "dawn of the 3rd millennium." Just :)

**Admittedly we might still be in that dawn, so changed to "... in the first two decades of the 21st century"**

Line 698: Thank you for thanking the reviewers!

**Added a thank you note to the editorial staff too!**