

Author responses

We thank Chris Smith and an anonymous reviewer for their help in improving this work.

Chris Smith

Abstract:

- delete “For the first time” right at the start.
- Hence ERF “may be” a more appropriate metric; could be stronger here, use “is”?

Line 175: partial *radiative* perturbation, rather than partial radiation perturbation?

Line 785: Hence using ERF we find “well” nearly three times the sensitivity – I think “well” should be deleted

These changes have been made

Anonymous reviewer

The authors have thoroughly addressed all my concerns. The key messages are now much clearer. This paper is an important contribution and timely for CMIP7/AR7. A few additional small edits the authors may wish to consider:

Figure 14 right panel typo on label (a) instead of (b). Use the same range for x- and y-axes?

line 912 in conclusions, specify that these are tropospheric ozone precursors?

These changes have been made