Dear Sir or Madam,

Thank you very much for the review of my paper. Here goes my responses in relation to the comments you have made. Please be sure that I am updating the manuscript right now to include all the wonderful points you have made.

1. Scope (deep water): Agreed. We will explicitly state in the Abstract, end of Introduction, and Conclusions that our focus is on deep-water sea states and that shallow/coastal effects are outside the present scope; this wording will be added in the next revision.

2. Recent mechanisms & citations: Thank you. We will add a brief paragraph in the Introduction summarizing depth-transition and wave–current mechanisms and cite Li et al. (2021), Li & Chabchoub (2023), and Li & Chabchoub (2024) in the next revision.

3. Phase-averaged vs phase-resolved: We will add 2–3 sentences clarifying that our analysis and conclusions pertain to phase-averaged (spectral) models (ERA5, CY47R1/WW3), and note that findings should not be generalized to phase-resolved solvers; this will be included in the next revision.

4. CTC interpretation & representative values: Good point. We will clarify that CTC reflects group coherence and is not a direct diagnostic of pure linear focusing with fixed S(f); we will add representative/synthetic values (linear Gaussian vs 2nd-order Stokes) and a short note (with citation) in Methods and a brief Supplement figure in the next revision.

5. Time window statement: We will add, at the start of Results & Discussion, a clear statement of analysis windows (FOWD 30-min records; model hourly collocation; 72-h event windows) in the next revision.

6. The ~25% not matching the CTC-dip criterion: We will add a short discussion noting typical characteristics (e.g., persistent swell with no prior dip, mixed/transitioning seas with noisy r, QC removal around events, or dips <0.1 or minima >0.5) and include 1–2 counter-examples in the Supplement in the next revision.

I really appreciate your review. Thank you very much!

Best Wishes,

Laura