

Version 3 of the manuscript, "Experiments with large number of GNSS-RO observations through the ROMEX collaboration in the Met Office NWP system", by Neill Bowler and Owen Lewis, satisfactorily addresses all of my questions and comments on the previous version. I therefore consider it now acceptable for publication.

However, I would like to suggest a few minor improvements to the text that was added or changed in this revision. I consider these improvements to be purely editorial and do not believe they require further review. They may be approved by the editor.

- Page 1, abstract, lines 6-8: I find the transition from the first paragraph to the second very difficult and confusing. Since the intent of the experiments is to assess the potential impact of the dataset, so this should be described first. The means and attempts to achieve a positive impact should come afterward.

- Page 7, line 143: "atmospheric quantifies" -> "atmospheric quantities"

- Page 15, line 235: "... fit of other observations ..." -> remove "other"

- Page 22, line 305: "biase" -> "bias"

- Page 26, lines 359-361:

"We conducted a very brief experiment which altered the operator to work directly from the temperature provided by the model indicated that this reduced the bias at high altitudes, bringing the statistics to be much closer to those of ECMWF (not shown)."

Am I right in assuming the authors wanted to write:

"We conducted a very brief experiment in which we altered the operator to work directly from the temperature provided by the model. This reduced the bias at high altitudes, bringing the statistics much closer to those of ECMWF (not shown)."

(or similar)?