

Response to Editor comments

The authors thank the editors for their gracious handling of the monster manuscript.

By [Olivier Marti](#)

Dear authors,

I thank you for this revised version and your convincing responses to the reviewers.

The paper is almost ready, but I still have a concern about the title.

In my first comment, I wrote "The paper address some general issues about regional ocean modeling. But a large part of the paper is based on applications and example with NEMO. So I think that is better, considering the general policies of GMD, to put a reference to NEMO in the title. "I think" means that I'm open to discussion if your opinion differs."

Then reviewers #1 writes comment #3 "NEMO focus not sign-posted in the title". You answered that the paper is of general scope and that you wanted to avoid to mention NEMO in the title. And that the abstract clearly explains that.

I find the abstract a bit misleading on this subject : **"This advice is compiled from across the user community, is presented in the context of NEMOv4, though aims to transcend NEMO version."** With this formulation, the reader may understand that to "transcend NEMO version" means that other NEMO version than v4 (older or future ones) might be concerned. If the project of the paper is to encompass regional ocean modelling with any model, this phrase does not reflect it, and needs a rephrasing.

Best regards, and thank you for publishing in GMD.

Olivier Marti
GMD Topical Editor

We are grateful for the careful reading and help we have had getting this right. We have revised the misleading section in the abstract accordingly to both clarify that we offer general advice for any regional ocean model, though we limit the practical examples to NEMOv4. This section now reads:

This advice is compiled from across the NEMO user community and sets out principles and practises that encompass regional ocean modelling with any model. Detail and region specific worked examples in Sections 3, 4, the linked companion repositories and DOIs all target NEMOv4.

By [Una Miškovic](#)

1. Coloured or marked text in *.pdf manuscript file is not allowed. Please provide a clean version of *.pdf manuscript file (with black text) for the next revision.

Done

2. For the next revision, I kindly ask you to remove the placeholder "Copyright statement" from page #1 in *.pdf manuscript version.

Done

3. Please avoid the use of footnotes. They have to be implemented within the main text, if possible.

Done. All the footnotes have been removed and the text has been moved into the body of the manuscript. (As an aside, I do not think that the loss of footnotes improves readability in any way but understand it could be a requirement to manage conversion to markdown. If there is a wishlist for system development, I would add better support footnotes).