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Dear Richard,

amongst the possible article types to be considered for peer-review publication on GMD, there is

- model experiment descriptions, including experimental details and project protocols

which is what we set out to do, and did, in our manuscript. You can find multiple cases in the previous literature in GMD where no novel results are described. For instance, see Tilmes et al. (2015) (https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/8/43/2015/) and Kravitz et al. (2015) (https://gmd.copernicus.org/articles/8/3379/2015/) for other works in GMD describing geoengineering experiments. In both, some preliminary results from a subset of models that already performed one or some of the experiments are shown. Having an easy to reference manuscript where novel experimental protocols are described in details is useful for other modeling centers aiming to reproduce similar experiments.

We have been happy to follow up with some more analyses as proposed. However, we believe that most of these analyses, in the framework of this new experimental set-up we proposed and that is different from previous experimental set-up we discussed, should be left to future works that can perform more in depth analyses.