

Editor's Comments

Thank you for submitting reply in the Interactive Discussion, the authors have made the manuscript more consistent with the referee's arguments. In my role as editor of GMD, you will see that both referees had judged the manuscript to “reconsidered after major revisions”.

First, please bring to your attention to the following requirement should meet in the Interactive Public Peer Review:

<https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/12/2215/2019/>

https://www.geoscientific-model-development.net/about/manuscript_types.html

Please make sure that manuscript more Accessible to GMD's Audience. (see major Issues on original submission by reviewer 2).

Second, all codes and data for these networks should be publicly available on a persistent archive (GitHub does not). The codes of the manuscript are provided on Zenodo but they do not appear to be complete. Generally, the code package could be made more helpful to other people by better code structure and standardization, and by the provision of some or all of the relevant data files - in particular the network parameters of the U-NET and U-STN.

So, my decision at this stage is to send your final revised manuscript to referees for a further review. Good luck.

Authors' Response

We thank the editor for their helpful comment. We have now edited and commented our code and sufficiently changed the structure to reflect modern standardization of machine learning codes while not sacrificing readability and understanding of the code structure. We have provided separate training files for each of our proposed models and baselines. We have uploaded the weights and biases files to facilitate reproducibility. We have put our codes on Zenodo and removed the link to Github (although Referee 2 had explicitly asked for it) since Github is not a persistent archive. However, in the comments, Referee 2 had mentioned that they have access to the codes on Github as well. We have updated those codes on Github as well.