

## RESPONSE TO THE EDITOR

### Editor decision: Publish subject to technical corrections

by Thom Bogaard

#### Comments to the author:

Dear Brian

thanks for the revised paper. I enjoyed reading it. It is long, but lively written and I can visualize you presenting it. I agree with the way you addressed the two reviews. I particularly think there is a nice balance now between references to earlier work and not too many references as it is an opinion paper with a build up of arguments for how chemical transport modelling (research) should be done (or what not should be done).

**Response:** I deeply appreciate the positive comments. We have made all noted technical corrections to the manuscript, as detailed below.

- A minor point is that I think the numerous use of "quotation marks" and italic font style and sometimes even combined, can be reduced. Often this in my opinion is adding a lot to the text or effective as writing style. So maybe review that.

**Response:** Done. The use of quotation marks and italics was reduced in several locations.

- Second, I think the figures would benefit from a visual scale in the corner of the figure. Even if it is approximated. (Fig 2 lower panel, fig 3 and 4)

**Response:** Done. Exact dimensions of domains in Figure 2, 3, and 4 are now provided.

- Minor observations:

Fig 3 caption: no doi reference needed here

**Response:** Done. Removed.

Fig 4 and 5 Caption: why (c) with permission if modified?

**Response:** Done. Corrected.

Section 5: Maybe one time remind the reader your work is on conservative chemical transport.

**Response:** Done. This is now noted in the first sentence of Section 5.

Lastly, thanks for this contribution to HESS, I am sure it will obtain quite some attention

**Response:** Many thanks!