

Reply to the editor's comments: gmd-2021-290

A. Zhao *et al.*

Correspondence: anni.zhao.16@ucl.ac.uk

We would like to thank the editor for accepting our manuscript with minor corrections. We have revised the manuscript as required. [Blue text below is our response to the editor's comments \(reproduced in black\).](#)

Dear Author,

5 Thank you very much for your revised manuscript that answers all my comments. Please include the following minor correction in the next version that you will submit for publication (lines refer to the version 4 of your manuscript):

[Thank you!](#)

L.36: "would be" -> "is" (would be sounds as if you did not provide what is needed)

10 [Thanks for pointing this out. We've changed "would be" to "is".](#)

L.49: "(or is going to) upload" -> "(or is going to upload)"

[We have moved the "\(" to its right place.](#)

15 L.164: "python" -> "Python"

[Done.](#)

L. 325: "at different repositories" -> "in different repositories"

["at" has been changed to "in".](#)

20

L. 333: "can be count" -> "can be found"

[We have corrected this.](#)

Figure 1: Thanks for reintroducing. I think the font of "PMIP4-CMIP6 entry card experiments" should be the same size than
25 "CMIP6 entry card experiments"

[Yes, you are right. We have changed the font size to the same. We have also made a few changes \(like the font of "PMIP4-CMIP4" and a typo "lig" -> "lgm"\) to make this figure look better.](#)

With best regards, Sophie Valcke