

Author comments in response to Reviewer 1's comments on “The Met Office Unified Model and JULES Global Atmosphere and Land 9.0 configuration” by Willett et al.

The reviewers' comments are copied below and our response to them included after each individual comment in red.

“The Met Office Unified Model and JULES Global Atmosphere and Land 9.0 configuration,” submitted to the GMD, documents the development of the GAL9 model. The methods and overall conclusions of the manuscript appear rigorous. I take it this is intended to be the primary documenting paper for a CMIP7 contributing model. I like the presentation of the model description and all major changes using this ticket scheme. I would also highlight that the software used herein, I take it, allows for an exceptional degree of traceability and reproducibility. That said, my only major comment is that I suggest further revisions throughout the text to improve the manuscript's flow and readability and ensure it reads as a cohesive piece. I also suggest making additions to the introduction and conclusion to make the intention of this as a CMIP7 documenting paper clearer and to include the needed background to that end. I also have several minor comments:

RESPONSE: The Authors would like to thank the reviewer for taking the time to review the manuscript and providing valuable comments. We believe that their contribution has resulted in a much-improved manuscript.

Although GAL9 will be used in CMIP7, the intended and actual applications are much wider than this and also include NWP and seasonal forecasting. The section describing the applications of GAL9 in the introduction has been expanded to reflect this.

We have responded to the specific comments below and made other changes in response the other reviewer. We believe that in combination these improve the manuscripts flow and readability.

L20: Suggest moving this discussion on naming conventions and versioning lower down to allow for an introduction that better prefaces the overall scope of the paper and later content.

RESPONSE: The discussion on naming conventions has been moved to lower down in the section.

L42: This section is very interesting for the sake of a broader readership, so I suggest explaining the scientific background motivating this scheme at the start of this paragraph prior to the more technical summary.

RESPONSE: A paragraph has been added to the start of the “The development process” section to state the aims of the development process.

Figures: Many of these figures appear quite small and difficult to parse, so I suggest revisions to improve readability and presentation. Particularly, the suite scorecard plots.

RESPONSE: The font size of the titles in the scorecard plots has been increased. The whitespace has also been adjusted which allows the scorecards to be presented slightly larger on the page. Where possible, the size of the other figures has been increased.

L9: NWP is not defined here

RESPONSE: Replaced NWP with numerical weather prediction (NWP)

L924: Suggest removing “this ticket” here and elsewhere in the text for the sake of flow.

RESPONSE: References to tickets has been removed from the description of the science changes and the ticket number have only been retained in parenthesis in the title for each change.

Citation: <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2026-2425-RC1>