

You addressed very well all points from my previous review, and the overall manuscript improved a lot. I have only very minor recommendations:

- I suggest improving the quality of Fig. 9 (labels are too small, in particular those of the colorbar).

We have enlarged label font sizes in this figure.

- In line 259 you say that the timing of the seasonal signal is captured well, but few lines before (l.255) you say that there is a lag of 2 months. This might be confusing.

The latter part of this sentence has been removed to be consistent with the earlier statement.

- l 363: do you really mean forecast or rather hindcast?

It's forecast to be consistent with the citation. But it really doesn't matter which one is used.

- Caption Fig. 05: for which region did you compute the average?

For domain average. The caption has been revised accordingly.