

Response to reviewer (*Deficient ocean–atmosphere feedbacks constrain seasonal NAO prediction* by Erik W. Kolstad)

I thank the reviewer and the editor for once again assessing the manuscript. Below, you'll find your comments in italicised, blue fonts and my responses in black.

Response to Reviewer

- *Line 9: Reconsider the wording “To examine its implications”. It sounds to me more like this is investigating the origins of this relationship, not the implications.*
- *Line 10: I think it would be clearer and more accurate if “These mechanisms” was dropped*

I agree and have now reorganised the abstract. There was also an inconsistency where I referred to the model before having introduced it.

Line 119: With the sentence at the beginning of the section deleted compared to the previous version, this section now starts abruptly, and it feels like something is missing

Good catch. I modified the sentence.

Line 174–175: I find this to be an unusual framing of the null hypothesis. Isn't the sign consistency test also falsifying a zero alpha-prime null hypothesis (which would be more intuitive)?

You're right. I modified the sentence to “the null hypothesis is that the SST-forced component (α') is zero or has the opposite sign to the total forcing onto the mediator (α)”. I hope you agree that this is clearer. I had also forgotten to refer to Figure 6f later in the text but have done this now.