**AC4**: We have identified a minor error in our Excel spreadsheet used to compute the contrail cirrus GWP20 and GWP100, and propose the following changes:

* Table 1:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Annual statistics | Units | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | 2019 vs. 2020 | 2019 vs. 2021 |
| Contrail cirrus GWP20d | - | ~~1.17~~**1.23** | ~~0.99~~**1.05** | ~~1.02~~**1.07** | -15% | -13% |
| Contrail cirrus GWP100d | - | ~~0.32~~**0.33** | ~~0.27~~**0.28** | ~~0.28~~**0.29** | -15% | -13% |

* **[Page 16, Lines 86 – 88]** “Our estimates (~~1.06~~**1.12** for GWP20 and ~~0.29~~**0.30** for GWP100) are ~~54~~**52**% smaller than Lee et al. (2021) (2.32 for GWP20 and 0.63 for GWP100)”
* **[Page 18, Lines 17 – 17]** “Globally, the 2019-2021 annual mean contrail cirrus GWP100 and GWP20 are estimated to be ~~0.29~~**0.30** and ~~1.06~~**1.12**, respectively (Table 1).”

**TS2, TS6, and TS7**: Due to the requested changes, we have to forward your requests to the handling editor for approval. To explain the corrections needed to the editor, please send me the reason why these corrections are necessary. Please note that the status of your paper will be changed to "Post-review adjustments" until the editor has made their decision. We will keep you informed via email.

* We have identified a minor error in our Excel spreadsheet used to compute the contrail cirrus GWP20 and GWP100. This error occurred because we mistakenly used the older AGWPCO2,20 and AGWPCO2,100 coefficients from Joos et al. (2013) instead of the updated best estimates from Gaillot et al. (2023). While we cited the latest coefficients correctly (see page 6, lines 39 to 43), we inadvertently used the older values in our spreadsheet.
* We note that this error only leads to very minor differences in GWP20 and GWP100 and does not affect any of the findings presented in this paper.

In addition, we also noticed a type error in Table 3 that originated from our end, where the row “contrail-contrail overlapping” and column “radiative heating effects” should be changed from “✕” to “✓”

**TS5**: Due to the requested changes, we have to forward your requests to the handling editor for approval. To explain the corrections needed to the editor, please send me the reason why these corrections are necessary. Please note that the status of your paper will be changed to "Post-review adjustments" until the editor has made their decision. We will keep you informed via email.

* We have identified this type error while reviewing the proof of the manuscript. We perform a sensitivity analysis by varying one model parameter at a time, and all the baseline simulations have the radiative heating effects activated. Therefore, the row “contrail-contrail overlapping” and column “radiative heating effects” should be changed from “✕” to “✓”.
* We note that this type error does not affect any of the results presented in this paper.
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