

Dear Reviewer

Thank you so much for your time.

REVIEW 2

I am not a native speaker of the language, but I have a reasonable command of it; however, I found it difficult to comprehend the manuscript's text. The article is written in a hard-to-understand language, with sentences constructed in a very complex manner. It gives the impression that AI assistance was used to make the phrases sound "more sophisticated."

Thank you very much for your kind observation. We promise to undertake a comprehensive review of the manuscript. If you have the patience to assist us to look at the work again, you will not find the same lapses as mentioned here. Thank you.

I assumed that a team of authors, who have published dozens of articles, does not need to be taught how to properly insert references into the text. References should be made to those articles that directly investigate the topic at hand, not to those that only briefly mention it. Understanding the text is greatly hindered precisely by the fact that the reviewer has to check the references in the text, or more precisely, their relevance to the specific part of the text (e.g., it is unclear why references to the article by Chakraborty et al., 2023 on line 33, Papailiou et al., 2024 on line 42, or Okike et al., 2025 on line 38 and further in many places throughout the text have been inserted). It gives the impression that the references were inserted thoughtlessly or to articles that have no direct relation to the issue under discussion. Please treat the matter of references in the text more seriously.

Thanks again for your advice here. We promise handle the matter of references very careful in the next round.

Table 1 contains incorrect data.

You are right. Thanks for the observation. We will correct them in the next round.

Section 3 does not describe the techniques used in the work. It is absolutely unclear how the FD lists presented in Tables 2-9 were obtained. There are no explanations of how the influence of the 11-year solar cycle on the data was removed.

This will be given adequate attention in the next round.

For my own understanding, I plotted the graph (data from <http://cr0.izmiran.ru/common/links.htm> were used for the period from 20 Feb 1998 to 2 Mar 1998), on which the most significant decrease in CR is observed on August 26, 1998, but this event is not even present in any of your lists. I cannot further evaluate the results of the work, as I believe that the FD lists you provided do not correspond to reality.

This event is in Table 2. However, while the onset of this event happened on 26/08/1998 (see the IZMIRAN FD on the FEID (<http://spaceweather.izmiran.ru/eng/fds1998.html>) list that times the onset of Fds, we time the of FD minimum. The FD minimum happened on 27/08/1998. This is why the event appears on 27/08/1998 in Table 2.

Nevertheless, following the comments of the reviewer #1, we have extended the analyses to other solar cycles and the events presented in a more careful manner.

The article requires significant revision or rejection at the editor's decision. It is necessary to describe how the initial FD lists were obtained, how the influence of the 11-year solar activity cycle

was removed, and to carefully verify the resulting data. Only after that should one proceed to consider various correlations.

Thank you very much. We will take care of all these if we are given the opportunity to revise the work.