

Response to referee #1

We thank referee #1 for reviewing the revised version of our manuscript and for the suggestions to further improve it. In the following we will respond to the comments and explain in detail the changes we made to the manuscript based on them. The reviewer's comments are in black italics, our responses are shown in blue.

I would like to thank the authors for carefully addressing my comments on the previous version of the manuscript. I find the revised manuscript substantially improved and much clearer. Some further minor points are listed below; otherwise I am happy to recommend the manuscript for publication.

Minor comments:

L193: The text still suggests that Figure 2 shows anomalies while the full values are shown.

We have removed the corresponding sentence.

L196-198: It might be useful to add reference to a standard statistical textbook, e.g.: Wilks, D.S. (2006) Statistical methods in the atmospheric sciences: an introduction, 2nd edition. Oxford, UK: Academic Press.

We thank the referee for suggesting this and added a corresponding reference.

L234: Suggest adding "...the RELATIVELY high reliability of spread in these regions..."

We have revised the sentence as suggested.

L297: Remove double "to"

Corrected.

L600-601: If by "both studies" you mean Scaife and Smith (2018) and Roberts and Vitart (2024) then I suggest spelling them explicitly ("both Scaife and Smith (2018) and Roberts and Vitart (2024)") because the former appears only in the previous paragraph. Also, Scaife and Smith did not analyze the subseasonal regime, therefore I suggest correcting to: "...subseasonal and seasonal regime."

We now explicitly reference the two studies and correctly refer to the subseasonal-to-seasonal regime.

L483-484: "Reanalysis observations" sounds strange. Perhaps once clarified that you use reanalysis as a substitute for observations you could use just "reanalysis"? Also, you could use "verification" wherever appropriate.

We now refer to it simply as "re-analysis data" (here and elsewhere) and clarify that we generally think of re-analysis data as observations within the study.

L492: Again "reanalysis observations", see my previous comment.

Corrected.

L661: The reference to Karpechko et al. (2025) is this one: Karpechko, A. Yu., Butler, A. H., and Vitart, F.: Signal, noise and skill in sub-seasonal forecasts: the role of teleconnections, *Weather Clim. Dynam.*, 6, 1661–1681, <https://doi.org/10.5194/wcd-6-1661-2025>, 2025.

Corrected.