

# Responses to the editor comments after the first review of the Climate DT manuscript

We address the comments made by the editor below. In addition, we have added some sentences to the acknowledgement section to recognise the work done by the reviewers and some other colleagues.

*1. Production quality of figures. The figures are of problematically low resolution such that the pixellation is visible and the text is consequently hard to read. Figures 1-3 are schematics and should be in a vector format where no pixellation will occur. Figure 4 is probably only available in bitmap but it should still be much higher resolution. Figures 5 and 6 appear to be a hybrid - a vector graphic should be used but the graph and map inserts may need to be bitmaps. If this is the case then these should be higher resolution. Figure 7 is a better bitmap (though higher resolution would still be a noticeable improvement). However here the text size in most of the plot elements is rather small. In order to be readable, text in the figures should be not much smaller than the body text of the manuscript.*

We are surprised by the coincidence of similar comments by both one reviewer and the editor about the quality of the figures. The figures that we inserted in the submitted file have the quality level requested in the journal guidelines. The pdf file that we produce displays the figures with a similar quality level and are not pixellated. We have the impression that the source of the problem might reside in a transformation made to the submitted pdf file. We submit the figures separately from the manuscript file, as requested by the system, for the editorial office to check if there is any problem with the source files.

We have also redrawn figures 4, 5, 6, and 7 to improve the text size, especially in the legends and axis titles and labels.

*2. There is a spurious semicolon on line 215 and a spurious full stop on line 669.*

This error, and a few additional similar errors, have been corrected in the revised manuscript.

*3. The sentence "It can be used without any restrictions" is not quite true since open source licences still impose some conditions. This also highlights that the code and data section is a bit hit and miss about licence conditions. The critical ones are the notes on the non-free software and as far as I can see, these are complete. I suggest removing the sentence above but instead at the beginning of the paragraph inserting "Except where specifically noted, the software used is open source under the licences listed in the relevant software archive."*

The sentence has been removed and the suggestion added as requested. An additional Zenodo reference has been added for completion.