I don’t think this paper is publishable; so sorry.

General Comments: Kalmaegi was a fast-moving TC. At 8 m/s, the TC traverses ~600 km in 1 day and spent ~6 hours traversing AE1 (or AE2) with a diameter of about 150 km. In such a super-critically moving storm, most of the wind effect on the ocean is therefore through mixing (including perhaps that caused by near-inertial internal wave breaking in the upper ocean in the wake of the storm) rather than the wind stress curl. The latter would require that wind acts on the ocean in a time scale longer than the inertial period (~1.5 days at 19N). I understand the authors' hypothesis of the negative WSC (thus convergence) on the left side, etc., but I don't think it is a demonstrable one in this case and is most likely incorrect. The increased AE1 after Kalmaegi (Fig.3, etc.) is likely a complex eddy adjustment process. One may suspect such adjustment also from Fig.3 in which the "warm" area between AE1 and AE2, including that on the left side, shrinks or weakens. That area would have expanded following the authors' hypothesis.

Two other general comments. 1) AE1’s increased amplitude, Ro and EKE = 1.3 cm, 1.4e-2 and 107 (cm/s)^2 are small. Are they statistically significant, and were errors and confidence levels estimated? Similarly for AE2. 2) Inertial oscillatory response persists long (~5 days and longer) after a storm passes (see e.g. Wu et al. Effect of Typhoon Kalmaegi (2014) on northern South China Sea explored using Muti-platform satellite and buoy observations data; Prog Oceanogr. 180 (2020) 102218). The effects of inertial motions on the Authors’ results and analyses were not discussed and I am unsure, for example, how the effects were filtered out or accounted for and how they may affect their estimates.

Other Comments:
L14: Rossby number (Ro = relative vorticity/Coriolis parameter);
L16: Rossby number;
L166: vertical feedback of the ocean by ... Kalmaegi: Not sure what this means, what "feedback", maybe "response..."?
Also: I assume GLORY assimilates Argo data but not the Station data. If so, then it is unsurprising that GLORY agrees with ARGO but not Station 5 (Figure 1).
Only Station 5 on the left side of the storm was used to support the authors' hypothesis. To support (refute?) the Authors' hypothesis I suggest using data from other Stations (except #3), right and left of Kalmaegi.
L223: ... weak wind stress curl, to be more precise. The term "wind shear" is also customarily taken as "vertical wind shear" in TC studies in meteorology so can be confusing.
L245: ... with 6-hourly dots.
.
.