

Editor Comments:

Public justification (visible to the public if the article is accepted and published):

The two reviewers on this paper declined/did not respond to invitations to re-review the paper, but I have carefully read over the manuscript myself and determined that the authors have adequately addressed their concerns.

Reply: We thank the editor for their encouragement. We have made point-by-point revisions to the corresponding opinions. Furthermore, we once again reviewed the manuscript and made necessary revisions and polishes to some of the words or grammar of sentence to enhance its overall quality.

Prior to publication, I would ask the authors to make the following technical corrections:

- Proofread the manuscript again for typos (e.g., line 314: height is misspelled)

Reply: We have revised the manuscript to correct the identified errors.

- Lines 366, 375: A barotropic response typically refers to similarly signed geopotential height anomalies in the upper and lower troposphere. The tropical anomalies associated with El Niño are oppositely signed between the upper and lower troposphere, which would be a baroclinic response. Please double check the terminology here and make sure you mean barotropic.

Reply: We have changed “barotropic” to “baroclinic ” in the revised manuscript.

- Line 599: The correlation values listed here do not match those shown in Figure 4 (misidentified as Figure 2 on this line of the text). Also, the model shown in Figure 10 appears to be worse for ozone than that shown in Figure 4, so this statement is not correct as written. Please revise accordingly to accurately compare the results in Figures 4 and 10.

Reply: We have made corresponding changes in the revised manuscript, following the editor’s comments.