

We would like to thank the reviewers for their time and efforts in making our paper clearer. We have addressed all the minor concerns raised by the reports at this stage. In addition we updated the data availability section to better reflect where the model data presented here will be accessible.

Report #1:

The authors addressed my earlier comments and made the manuscript clearer. Unless the other reviewer(s) identify new additional problems, I recommend acceptance of the manuscript, conditional to the following minor changes. (1) The new Table S1 (in Supplement) completely lacks units. Please add units in Table S1 for all variables.

**Response: Units have now been added to the caption for Table S1. Thank you for pointing out this issue to us as again it helps make the paper clearer.**

(2) The caption for the new Table S2 (in Supplement) needs clarifications. How are the correlations computed? Is it a spatial correlation between, e.g., surface pCO<sub>2</sub> anomaly and surface temperature anomaly? The reader shouldn't have to guess these things!

*Response:*

The caption text used to read:

**The R<sup>2</sup> between the anomalies in Table 1 and either Table 1 or Table S1 with values >0.5 highlighted in grey.**

We have now altered this to read:

**The R<sup>2</sup> between the anomalies in Table 1 and either Table 1 or Table S1 with values >0.5 highlighted in grey. For example for the correlations between pco<sub>2</sub> and TA over the 200 m avg – the correlations are between the ΔpCO<sub>2</sub> in the 200 m avg section from table 1 for the entire CCS region (column C) from the downscaled models and the TA from column B from Table S1 for the 200m row.**

Report #2:

I identified a few minor language errors in the new text that should be fixed.

Response:

Ok, without specific direction from the reviewer, we followed your advice and focused on the new text. Upon another read through of the newer text, we found some minor edits and edited the document accordingly.