

RC2: 'Comment on egusphere-2025-3986', Stefania Angela Ciliberti, 10 Nov 2025

General comments: this paper presents a new implementation of the Norkyst v3 operational system in the very complex Norway coastal area. The system is based on ROMS whose model configuration and upstream data are described in Sections 2 and 3.

The paper could benefit from a dedicated section that introduces the validation methodology before going to Section 4, which is about results.

Answer: The introduction to Section 4 has been refined to make it more clear. Please see our reply to RC1.

Some references seem to be missing - for instance, upstream data used for the validation are mentioned but not referred, and that could help in the reproducibility.

Answer: We have included the missing references

Figures 7 and 8 might benefit from some additional work to improve readability.

Answer: The figures have been refined and simplified.

Section 5 might need some improvement to better address the operational implementation of the system and the added value for users, including specific services at users' disposal for the access to forecast products and the associated product catalogue: the 2 subsections are quite short and I am sure the system is much more complex, so I would encourage the Authors to better balance this part of the paper, given its importance.

Answer: Since most of the details of the forecast system is similar to the hindcast system, they are not repeated. However, we have included some additional information and some examples of use of the operational products.

In the Conclusions, some key messages from the assessment could be reported and emphasized.

Answer: Yes, indeed. We have included some highlights from the validation.

An additional suggestion: intercomparison against available operational products in the area might significantly help to demonstrate the added value of Norkyst v3.

Answer: For our region it is only ARC MFC (i.e. "TOPAZ", which we are nesting into) that provides continuous forecast fields in addition to Norkyst, and TOPAZ lacks the necessary resolution for meaningful comparison especially in the fjords. Having said that, we are working on extending our validation and monitoring to include a side-by-side comparison of the shelf and open ocean dynamics, aiming to have it available through EDITO later this year. It is in our own interest too that TOPAZ should be as good as possible, of course, and we work closely with the TOPAZ developers.

Additional comments/suggestions are given in the supplement.

Answer: These comments are taken into account in the revised manuscript.