

Dear Editor,

Thank you for your time and for the feedback provided on our revised manuscript. We appreciate your thorough review and the opportunity to address the remaining technical corrections. Below, we outline our responses to the comments you have raised. We believe these changes further clarify our work and ensure the accuracy and consistency of the manuscript.

**Comment: Line 72. “equatorward” → “equatorward-facing”?**

R: We agree with your suggestion and have changed "equatorward" to "equatorward-facing" in line 72 to improve clarity and accuracy.

**Line 184 and table 2. I am still struggling with this. Lines 186-187 imply that ERA5 values have smaller magnitude than the observations. This is consistent with “underestimate” in line 184 but not with table 2 where the caption rather implies that ERA5 has the negative bias relative to observations. Maybe the table 2 caption needs to be explicit that the bias is observations relative to ERA5 (or perhaps preferably the other way round with positive bias).**

R: Thank you for your comments. To clarify, the negative bias, calculated as observations minus ERA5 data, means that, in general, ERA5 values are larger than the observations. This can occur for two reasons:

1. When the values are positive, the magnitude of the observations is smaller.
2. When the values are negative, the magnitude of the observations is larger, and therefore more negative.

Upon analyzing the data point by point, it was observed that in this case, the second situation (i.e., observations having larger negative values) occurs more frequently. Therefore, although the bias is negative, for northerly winds, the observations tend to be more negative than ERA5. To better illustrate this point, the example of the most negative values is provided.

This point has been clarified in the text by replacing the original paragraph with the following:

"The negative bias in meridional wind, calculated as observations minus ERA5 data, indicates that ERA5 generally reports higher values (i.e., less negative for negative values and greater for positive values) compared to observations at Carriel Sur and Punta Hualpén. This is primarily due to ERA5's tendency to underestimate the intensity of northerly winds, resulting in less negative values than those observed. For instance, ERA5's most negative values typically range between -15 and -16 m/s, while observations at Carriel Sur and Punta Hualpén often exceed -20 m/s (not shown)."

Additionally, the caption for Table 2 has been updated to:

"Comparative statistical analysis of ERA5 data relative to local observations for sea level pressure, zonal wind, and meridional wind. The bias is defined as observations minus ERA5 data, where a negative bias indicates that ERA5 values are greater than the observations (i.e., less negative for northerly winds or more positive for southerly winds). CS: Carriel Sur Station; PH: Punta Hualpén Station."

We hope this explanation clarifies the point.

**Line 193. Better “declining” → “negative” or “overall”; I don’t think you want to imply that the trend is changing.**

R: Thank you for your suggestion. We have revised line 193 to read: "Over the past four decades, an overall trend of -0.1 cyclones per year was observed, both when considering cyclones throughout the year and when specifically analyzing winter cyclones." This change clarifies that the trend is negative without implying a change in the direction of the trend.