Author's response and changes point by point

Referee comment in black

Author's answer in blue

Author's Changes in red in the revised manuscript in red

Anonymous Referee #1

The manuscript applies individual foraminifera analysis (IFA) $\delta^{18}O$ across four oceanographically distinct sites in the tropical Indian Ocean to evaluate variability resulting from seasonality and extreme climate events. While IFA is a well-established concept, the authors extend its application to the tropical Indian Ocean by combining new measurements with previously published records. The forward modelling approach uses ORAS5 reanalysis to simulate $\delta^{18}O$ of calcite ($\delta^{18}Oc$) at surface (0.5m) and thermocline (97m) depths. The forward-modelled distributions are compared with core-top IFA $\delta^{18}Oc$ of G. ruber and N. dutertrei, except for the lack of thermocline species data from the eastern tropical Indian Ocean site. Climate sensitivity is assessed by introducing ±75% perturbations in ORAS5 temperature and salinity, modifying only seasonal amplitude at the surface and both seasonal amplitude and temporal frequency at the thermocline

The scientific premise is relevant and the manuscript falls within the scope of CP. The core-top IFA $\delta^{18}Oc$ data are sufficient to support the broad interpretations and conclusions. However, the forward modelling framework rests on several simplifying assumptions that limit the realism of the outputs. These assumptions need to be either improved or more rigorously justified. Significant revisions to the methodology are therefore required before the manuscript can be considered for publication.

We thank Reviewer 1 for their comments, which helped greatly in improving and clarifying the manuscript. We reply below point by point to their remarks.

General comments:

1) The authors used ORAS5 reanalysis data for forward modelling $\delta^{18}Oc$ at surface (0.5 m) and thermocline (97 m) depths. Since ORAS5 forms the foundation of the results and discussion, the authors should first evaluate how well ORAS5 reproduces observed conditions near the proxy sites. Comparisons with instrumental datasets (e.g., satellite-derived SST and SSS, buoy-based temperature and salinity observations) need to be presented (in supplementary). Additionally, a comparison with other reanalysis products such as HadISST (surface), GODAS (surface and thermocline), and SODA3 would strengthen confidence in the reanalysis-based approach and help assess the sensitivity of results to the choice of reanalysis product.

We thank the reviewer for this suggestion. We used ORAS5 reanalysis because it was widely used in previous palaeoceanographic studies, including for analogous IFA sensitivity analysis already performed in the tropical Pacific Ocean (see e.g., *Glaubke et al., 2021*). We have now added to the Supplementary Material a validation of ORAS5 against three out of the four other sources suggested by the referee, including two reanalysis products (HadISST1.1, see *Rayner et al., 2003*) for surface temperature, GODAS (*Behringer & Xue, 2004*) for both surface and thermocline temperature and salinity. We also compare ORAS-5 with the instrumental dataset EN4 (*Good et al., 2013*) for both surface and thermocline temperature and salinity for the 1980–2018 period. We attempted to download the SODA reanalysis product, but all links towards each iteration of the SODA3 and their subsequent SODA4 products are down from their *University of Maryland* website.

Validation against independent datasets confirms that ORAS5 reliably captures both the seasonal cycle and interannual variability of surface temperature at the four proxy sites (see new Supplementary Figure 1 that will be added to the revised manuscript). Depending on the site and the depth we are tracking, there are small differences in the mean and/or amplitude recorded by other reanalysis datasets or instrumental data.

For the seasonal SST component that pilots at first order the computed calcite δ18Oc we target, we observe two sites where all products show near-perfect agreement (sites MD96-2060 and U1467), and two other sites that match with very high confidence, albeit with some features (such as the magnitude of the cooling occurring during summer monsoon upwelling at site NIOP905, and the upwelling season at SO189-39KL) not perfectly captured in one or more products. Yet all the seasonal variability, including at sites where two SST minima are recorded, are well captured both in the structure of the seasonal cycles and the absolute temperature values. For salinity, which only affects surface δ18Oc calculation at second order, a very good match is also observed, with the EN4 product having difficulties capturing the salinity maximum one would expect during the upwelling seasons at NIOP905 and SO189-39KL sites. It is unclear whether the reanalysis products are biased by the Ocean Model boundary effects and/or the gridding, or the instrumental lagrangian profiles used in the EN4 dataset were unable to capture the full structure of the mentioned sites, as we note that the dynamic Somalian and Indonesian margins are undersampled in comparison with more offshore locations (see https://www.metoffice.gov.uk/hadobs/en4).

For the interannual SST component, all products show very good agreement for temperature with r2 ranging from 0.49–0.68 at MD96-2060, 0.54–0.57 at U1467, and 0.29–0.43 at SO189-39KL ($p < 0.001$ in all cases). NIOP 905 shows lower but still significant interannual correlations ($r2 = 0.11–0.26$, $p < 0.001$).

For the thermocline depth that, as suggested later by the reviewer, will mainly drive the IFA interannual changes, we also find p-values>0.999 at each site for each tested product.

For surface salinity, interannual correlations are generally low at all sites ($r2 < 0.08$, p values ranging from non-significant at MD96-2060 to < 0.001 at other sites), which is partly consistent with known difficulties that reanalysis products have in simulating salinity variability in the tropical Indian Ocean, especially for the subsurface. For subsurface salinity, interannual correlations are also generally low at most sites ($r2 < 0.14$, p values ranging from non-significant to < 0.001). A notable exception is SO189-39KL, where interannual subsurface salinity correlations are significant across all products ($r2 = 0.31–0.55$, $p < 0.001$), likely reflecting the strong influence of the Indonesian Throughflow on thermocline salinity variability at this site. However, the difference in amplitude between the different reanalysis data are less than 0.2 psu, so given that subsurface salinity contributes only marginally to the variance of forward-modelled δ18Oc as compared to temperature (See QQ-plot Fig. 7), computing a r^2 does not make much sense in this case.

Overall, this validation demonstrates that ORAS-5 faithfully reproduces the large-scale temperature and salinity conditions at the four proxy sites, and is therefore appropriate in our forward modelling framework. The supplementary figures and statistics are provided in the revised Supplementary Material (Figure S1).

Author's changes in the manuscript: As the referee recommended, we have added new Supplementary Figure S1 about ORAS5 validation against GODAS, EN4, and HadISST. Also, we have added a paragraph to discuss this in **section 3.1.1 at lines 187 to 196**.

2) Assigning a single fixed depth for the surface (0.5m) and thermocline (97m) uniformly across all sites and through time is a significant simplification. Thermocline depth is neither spatially constant (Fig. 2A) nor temporally stable, it varies with monsoon phase, extreme climate events, and regional oceanographic dynamics. The authors should consider integrating temperature and salinity data over the mixed layer and thermocline depth ranges, accounting for their spatial and temporal variability, to produce a more physically realistic forward-modelled δ18Oc distribution.

We agree with the reviewer, and this choice to allow one fixed depth for the depth model grid at 0.5 and 97 m was oversimplified. We have tested the sensitivity of our forward modelling time series δ18Oc distribution by comparing outputs obtained at fixed depth with an average temperature and salinity defined over a depth range.

For the surface, we have compared the 0.5 m fixed depth with the integrated 0–50 m depth range to compute the forward-modelled δ18Oc timeseries. In three out of the four sites we see no difference in the computed *G. ruber* δ18Oc forward modelled timeseries. At site SO189-39KL, the integration of the upper 50 m removes part of the variability, in particular at the interannual time scale. This is quantitatively confirmed by the raw δ18Oc time series: the standard deviation of the difference between the two extraction methods is 3–4 times larger at SO189-39KL ($\sigma = 0.12–0.20$‰) than at the other three sites ($\sigma = 0.03–0.07$ ‰; Fig. S2), consistent with the sharper vertical

T/S gradients associated with this upwelling-influenced site. This is because the site lies within an upwelling zone, where interannual anomalies are expressed as short, intense signals concentrated very close to the surface; averaging over the upper 50 m dilutes these signals with more stable subsurface waters. Preserving this surface-concentrated variability is essential, as it is precisely the signal used in Thirumalai et al. (2019) to infer changes in interannual variability, and the sampling strategy at this site was specifically designed around this upwelling signature. We therefore retain *G. ruber* as the interannual variability recorder at this site, consistent with the original publication by Thirumalai et al. (2019), even though this species is known to live within the upper part of the mixed layer. We hence think that integrating the first 50 meters of the water column in that case would contribute to alter our model-forward exercise as it would remove the extreme interannual events we track in our study. We further note that this feature fits with the real sedimentary core-tops and its forward-modelled IFA we present in the second part of the article as being the most variable site despite being derived from surface-dwelling foraminifera.

For the thermocline, we have compared the 97 m fixed depth with the integrated 70-120 m water depth range to compute the forward-modelled δ18Oc timeseries derived, omitting that of the SO189-39KL because we only use *G. ruber* at this site. Both water depth assignments methods in the forward-modelled δ18Oc of subsurface-dwelling foraminifera (*N. dutertrei*) lead to nearly identical timeseries, with the standard deviation of the difference between the two methods remaining below 0.045‰ at all three sites (MD96-2060, NIOP 905, U1467), demonstrating that defining the modelled *N. dutertrei* depth habitat at a fixed or an integrated water column does not change the modelled δ18Oc timeseries. This is because in the thermocline, the temperature gradient with depth is so high that even changing an assigned living habitat depth by a few tens of meters would not alter the full thermocline variability as modelled in IFA for the three sites where *N. dutertrei* were used (Fig. S2).

We further checked by quantifying this water depth assignment method its impact on the simulated S.D. on random 60 IFA for MD96-2060, NIOP 905 and U1467 sites. The results confirm that the choice of a depth range vs. a fixed depth has a negligible effect (ΔSD remaining below 0.05‰ for the simulated IFA SD with raw ORAS5 data, and below 0.065‰ after seasonal and/or interannual amplification, representing less than 15% of the total simulated IFA SD at these sites.

The sensitivity test figures for fixed depth versus depth ranges are provided in the revised Supplementary Material (Fig. S2). For readability and to ease comparison between sites to evaluate their sensitivity, we kept the simulations as initially produced and we discuss in the revised manuscript both case with fixed or range depth.

As an additional check to further address the reviewer's concern, we regenerated the main time-series figure (Fig. 4) using the depth-integrated layer extraction (0–50 m surface, 70–120 m thermocline) instead of the fixed-depth approach. The resulting patterns are broadly consistent with those obtained using fixed depths, confirming that our conclusions are not sensitive to this methodological choice.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added a Supplementary Figure S2 to test the sensitivity of δ^{18}Oc time series to fixed depth vs. layer-averaged extraction.

A new paragraph has been added in Section 3.1.1 explaining that we favour layer-integrated extraction for realism, except at SO189-39KL, where the fixed 0.5 m depth is retained to preserve the near-surface interannual signal central to this upwelling-influenced site in **section 3.1.1 Lines 197 to 203.**

3) The authors artificially introduced ±75% variability in temperature and salinity to simulate extreme climate events but do not adequately justify this choice beyond citing Thirumalai and Clemens (2020), whose study focuses on the northern Bay of Bengal, a region highly sensitive to salinity changes due to large freshwater fluxes and therefore oceanographically distinct from the four sites used here. The authors first need to quantify the realistic upper and lower bounds of ENSO- and IOD-related variability at each of the four oceanographically distinct sites before applying a uniform ±75% perturbation. For example, the annual SST range at site MD96-2060 (western tropical Indian Ocean) is approximately 3.5°C (Fig. 1a). Increasing this variability by 75% would yield a range of ~6.1°C. It is therefore necessary to demonstrate whether such variability is actually observed during ENSO or IOD events at this site. Without such evidence, the interpretation appears overstated

We understand that the ±75% alteration applied invariably at all sites could be confusing given the flowchart of the analysis we describe in the article. As the flowchart targets two distinct objectives with different methodologies to validate the IFA method at the oceanic scale with only few sites, we will now introduce a flowchart at the end of the introduction with more detailed description of each step (flowchart conceptualized using A.I. for the form and colors).

Indeed, adopting Thirumalai & Clemens (2020) or any other amount of alteration would not much change the results given the objectives of the analysis: describing which site and which species could be valuable to detect an increase or a decrease of seasonality or interannual variability. We never claim to estimate by how much the variability of another period in the past had changed because, given the uncertainties, we think that having an amount of e.g.+/- half a seasonal/interannual shift in variability would just be unreachable. However, our analysis is framed to identify regions and species that will likely be most sensitive to track past changes. By essence, the 75% alteration has to be invariable to allow comparison of the sites and depths sensitivities to distinguish among sites and species those able to reconstruct changes in larger-scale structures of interest such as the Indian monsoon or the IOD.

This choice is further supported by the analysis of peak ENSO and IOD events in the ORAS5 reanalysis (1958–2018), which shows that thermocline temperature anomalies during the strongest events range from 2.69°C to 6.58°C across the four sites, representing approximately 50–75% of the mean seasonal amplitude at each site. The ±75% perturbation therefore represents a physically meaningful upper bound for altered variability states, rather than an arbitrary scaling factor. For example, the MD96-2060 site could well have behaved completely differently during a given glacial period, so we must consider such a possibility to envision whether IFA could be helpful to resolve it in later paleo studies. We hope that the new flowchart will help illustrate the main aim of the analysis we performed: first perform an idealized simulation of a virtual different ocean with increased or decreased variabilities, and second provide realistic model-data comparison using regional specific parameters.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added text in **Section 3.1.2 Lines 299 to 302**, quantifying peak ENSO/IOD thermocline temperature anomalies about 2.69 to 6.58°C across the four sites, representing ~50–75% of the amplitude to justify the ±75% perturbation as a physically meaningful upper bound rather than an arbitrary scaling factor.

About the flowchart figure, we finally chose to put it in the supplementary to avoid overloading the method section (Figure. S4).

4) *"The authors state (Lines 207–211 and 330–332) that only seasonal amplitude is altered at the surface, whereas both amplitude and frequency of interannual events are modified at thermocline depths. What is the rationale for not introducing interannual frequency changes at the surface as well? This methodological choice requires clarification and justification."*

We thank the reviewer for this methodological point. The choice to modify only seasonal variability at the surface was for two reasons. The first is that in the western tropical Indian Ocean, temperature variability is dominated by the seasonal cycle rather than interannual variability. The second reason is more methodological as outlined in our response to general comment 3, this idealized design a seasonal perturbation at the surface versus a combined amplitude and frequency perturbation at the thermocline was deliberately chosen as part of the simplification exercise inherent to our forward-modelling approach, to test how sensitive the IFA distribution mean and SD are to distinct modes of variability change under an altered simulated climate. However, ORAS5 time series show that our four sites have mean surface temperature anomalies during peak ENSO/IOD events (July–November) that range from ±0.1 to ±0.4°C, compared to climatological seasonal ranges of 1.2–6.0°C depending on the site. Interannual variability thus represents a minor fraction of total surface variability.

To directly address this concern, we additionally ran the forward model under three configurations for *a* surface range depth (0-40 m) at all four sites. We compared seasonal change only, interannual change and both combined. The results reveal distinct patterns depending on the site. At MD96-2060 and NIOP 905, interannual changes produce nearly identical or lower IFA SD than seasonal (0.57 vs 0.58 ‰ and 0.57 vs 0.69 ‰ respectively), confirming that seasonal variability dominates surface IFA dispersion at these western sites. At U1467 and SO189-39KL, we observe a dominance of interannual variability rather than seasonality (0.54 vs 0.43 ‰ and 0.48 vs 0.30

‰) reflecting the stronger ENSO/IOD surface signature at these central and eastern Indian ocean sites. We acknowledge that a combined seasonal and interannual perturbation at the surface increases IFA SD by 0.17 to 0.25 ‰ across sites, and note that this sensitivity test will be added and discussed in the revised manuscript to the to allow the reader to assess the impact of this methodological choice.

Author's changes in the manuscript: Added text in **Section 3.1.2 Lines 302 to 308**, (following the General Comment 3). This paragraph presents a new sensitivity test comparing seasonal-only, interannual-only, and combined perturbations at the surface (0–40 m), all four sites in a new Supplementary Figure S6 added.

5) The use of site names throughout the discussion is difficult to follow. It would improve readability if the authors consistently referred to the sites using regional identifiers such as western Arabian Sea, western tropical Indian Ocean, central tropical Indian Ocean, and eastern tropical Indian Ocean. Otherwise, readers must repeatedly refer back to Figure 1 to identify the site locations.

We have done this in the revised manuscript.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have simplified the reading of the discussion by avoiding repetition of name sites with the abbreviation of each geographical region defined in the **regional setting section 2 (Study sites).** The abbreviations are: IODP Site U1467 located in the central tropical Indian Ocean (CTIO) Site NIOP 905, in the Western Arabian Sea (WAS) Site SO189-39KL, located in the eastern tropical Indian Ocean (ETIO) and are now used in the **discussion section**.

6) The authors need to report nearby seasonal flux, and habitat-depth information for G.ruber and N.dutertrei from the FORCIS database (https://doi.org/10.1038/s41597-023-02264-2) in the Supplementary Material. Since the study interprets the SD of d18O G.ruber and N.dutertrei as reflecting climate variability, forward modelling using realistic habitat depth and seasonal flux data would be more appropriate than assuming constant carbonate flux at fixed depths (0.5 m and 97 m). Incorporating these parameters would substantially improve the paleoclimate relevance of the modelling framework.

First, regarding the habitat depth, constraining the calcification depth of planktonic foraminifera from the FORCIS plankton net observational database in the Indian Ocean is inherently difficult. Also, the data present two biases identified as a lack of data in some regions of the Indian Ocean, and the fact that distributions are complexified by the fact that non-stratified nets integrate over large depth intervals, potentially capturing specimens well above their preferred habitat depth. This means that a surface-dwelling species like *G. ruber* may appear at 100 m simply because the net was deployed between 0 and 200 m. Still, we have compiled available plankton net data from the FORCIS database from locations close to our sites. Three out of four study sites (NIOP 905, U1467, SO189-39KL) nonetheless confirm the expected qualitative pattern, with *G. ruber* consistently captured shallower in the water column than *N. dutertrei*, even though the absolute depth estimates themselves remain unreliable for the reasons outlined above. No plankton net data are available near MD96-2060, which reflects a data gap. Given these uncertainties, we cannot use these observations with confidence to constrain calcification depths in the tropical Indian Ocean.

The modelling depth of 0.5 m is therefore retained as representative of the surface mixed layer signal recorded by *G. ruber.* consistent with its well-documented surface habitat (Fairbanks et al., 1982). For *N. dutertrei*, the FORCIS-based average occurrence depth in the Indian Ocean is 41.31 ± 3.59 m (range 10–150 m; Chaabane et al., 2026), reflecting its broad vertical range spanning the base of the mixed layer to the sub-thermocline. We note however that this estimate is likely biased towards shallower depths, as non-stratified net tows integrate over large depth intervals and may capture specimens well above their preferred habitat depth. Analysis of ORAS5 reanalysis data at our four sites indicates that the thermocline depth averages 83–107 m (±19–37 m) across sites, placing the 97 m reference depth consistently within one standard deviation of the mean thermocline depth at all sites. Also, as we argue in our manuscript, this species is mainly related to the Deep Chlorophyll Maximum and not directly to the thermocline. In response to the previous comment, the forward model has been updated to extract temperature and salinity averaged over a depth layer of 70–120 m rather than at a fixed point, better capturing the habitat variability of this species depending also on the site. This modification does not substantially alter the IFA standard deviations reported in the study (Fig. S2).

For the seasonal flux, we extracted sediment trap data from the FORCIS database (Chaabane et al., 2023) within a ±10° box around each core site to characterise the seasonal flux of *G. ruber* and *N. dutertrei.* The availability of the data and the proximity of the traps can vary considerably and lead to uncertainties. NIOP 905 benefits from a near trap (AS8, <1 km), providing a robust local flux record. For the remaining three sites, the nearest available traps are located 1312 km (U1467), 1223 km (SO189-39KL), and 946 km (MD96-2060) from the core sites respectively, reflecting the chronic undersampling of sediment trap records in the tropical Indian Ocean. These distances introduce uncertainty in the seasonal flux weights applied at these sites, as the trap records may not fully capture the local flux seasonality. Nevertheless, the seasonal patterns derived from these traps are coherent with known regional oceanographic forcing by the Indian SW monsoon at U1467 and NIOP 905 and the Australian SE monsoon upwelling at SO189-39KL, suggesting that the broad seasonal signals are regionally representative despite the spatial offset. The MD96-2060 record additionally comprises only 39 sediment cup samples spanning 2.3 years, further limiting its temporal resolution.

In response to the reviewer's comment, we assessed a sensitivity test to the forward model which has been updated to weight the monthly sampling of δ18Oc values by the normalized monthly flux weights derived from the FORCIS trap data (Fig. S3). This modification introduces a seasonally realistic bias in the simulated IFA population,

favouring months of high productivity. Incorporating this flux weighting modifies the IFA SD by +0.0003‰ to −0.082‰ across sites and species (Wilcoxon test, non-significant at MD96-2060 *N. dutertrei* and U1467 *G. ruber*; $p<0.001$ elsewhere). The largest absolute difference is recorded at SO189-39KL for N. dutertrei (−0.082‰, −9.1%). At NIOP 905, the flux-weighted IFA SD for *N. dutertrei* increases significantly (+9.5%) rather than decreasing, reflecting the site-specific complexity and influence of upwelling dynamics on subsurface flux seasonality, consistent with sampling occurring predominantly during the SW monsoon at this site.

We therefore show that the global dynamic and the comparison of site by total variability under both configurations and with both species remains the same. The highest surface SDs are still in the western site with MD96-2060 and NIOP 905 and subsurface in the east at site SO189-39KL. We then updated the forward-modelled script with this suggestion for future comparison. As we look at the SD and the range in IFA distribution, we demonstrated here that the main conclusion of the study is still robust regardless of the method used.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added a discussion about this in **Section 5.3.2 Lines 863 to 877,** reporting the FORCIS data for *N. dutertrei* occurrence depth, sediment trap and flux-weighting sensitivity results. We also add a Supplementary Figure S10 to test the forward modelling results with and without flux-weighting.

7) *"At present, the manuscript relies on forward modelling mean and variability of δ18Oc at fixed depths (0.5 m and 97 m), assuming constant monthly carbonate flux, a single δ18O paleotemperature equation across species, and constant δ18Ow–salinity relationships across all sites. These assumptions move the model outputs away from realistic oceanographic conditions. To make the forward-modelling framework more robust and useful for the paleoclimate community, the following revisions are recommended: a) Define the habitat depth and its variability for G. ruber and N. dutertrei at each site using nearby plankton-net or sediment-trap observations (e.g., FORCIS database). b) Incorporate seasonal flux information from sediment-trap records near the proxy sites (e.g., FORCIS database). c) Use regional and depth-specific δ18Ow–salinity relationships for both surface and thermocline waters, given that the four sites are oceanographically distinct. d) Apply species-specific δ18O paleotemperature equations instead of using the G. bulloides equation of Bemis et al. (1998) for all species. e) Propagate uncertainties through each modelling step and include them in the final outputs. f) Introduce realistic climate perturbations at both surface and thermocline depths based on observed ENSO/IOD variability near the study sites. Such modifications would make the forward-model outputs substantially more realistic and scientifically valuable for the IFA and paleoclimate communities."*

Each of the recommended modifications has been addressed individually in our responses above. Specifically: habitat depth (point a) and seasonal flux (point b) are addressed in our response to General Comment 6; regional δ^{18}Ow–S relationships (point c) are addressed in our response to Specific Comments 5–6; species-specific paleotemperature equations (point d) are addressed in our response to Specific Comment 4; realistic climate perturbations at surface and thermocline depths (point f) are addressed in our response to General Comment 3.

Regarding uncertainty propagation (point e), we address this below and include this recommendation in our forward-modelling steps.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added in **section 3.1.2 Lines 311 to 314**, the precision that we also add uncertainties in our forward-model explaining that paleotemperature and δ^{18}Ow–S equation parameters are resampled from their reported uncertainties at each iteration, addressing General Comment 7 point (e) on uncertainty propagation.

Specific comments:

1) *Line 47: The authors state "drier northeast monsoon during boreal winter." However, the northeast monsoon delivers substantial rainfall over southern India, Sri Lanka, and parts of Southeast Asia.*

Done, we have revised the sentence accordingly to better reflect the regional pattern of northeast monsoon precipitation.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We corrected this statement **line 47**: "and a northeast monsoon during boreal winter, which brings substantial rainfall to southern India, Sri Lanka, and parts of Southeast Asia, while resulting in drier conditions over much of the northern Indian Ocean and South Asia."

2) *Figure 1: The authors used annual range for surface waters and SD for thermocline waters. Please specify the depth range over which the averages were calculated. Since the study objective is related to validating IFA δ18O SD, why not also present SD for surface waters in the figure?*

We thank the reviewer for this point. We have updated the caption to specify the depth used for each panel. As discussed before, we use a fixed depth that is representative of two distinct vertical depth zones: surface and subsurface. The goal of this figure is to introduce the global Indian Ocean variability with the studied site but also the difference between the surface and subsurface variability. We prefer to use surface-layer annual range instead of SD in this figure, because it illustrates where in the Indian Ocean the maxima and minima of seasonality occur.

Nevertheless, we have updated the main figure to show standard deviation for the surface and we will use this new version of this figure in the revised manuscript. It shows the same pattern of variability for each variable, with the northwestern area most sensitive to changes in seasonal variability. Moreover, the standard deviation of δ^{18}Oc is spatially the same as the temperature pattern.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have updated the **Figure 1. A-C** with the surface standard deviation instead of annual range.

3) Lines 160–161: Please report the mean thermocline depth and its standard deviation for the four sites based on ORAS5 reanalysis.

Done, we have added in this paragraph the mean thermocline depth and the associated standard deviation for all sites extracted from ORAS5 based on the depth of maximum vertical temperature gradient over 1958–2018: 83.2 ± 30.7 m at MD96-2060, 103.3 ± 37.9 m at NIOP 905, 85.1 ± 17.6 m at U1467, and 90.2 ± 27.2 m at SO189-39KL. We note that the selected thermocline depth (97 m) falls within the standard deviation of the mean thermocline at all sites.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have reported in **section 3.1.1 lines 210-213,** all the thermocline depth and its standard deviation for the four sites

4) Lines 163–164: Why are species-specific equations not being used? Instead, the study applies the G. bulloides and O. universa equations from Bemis et al. (1998) to simulate δ18Oc for G. ruber and N. dutertrei.

Done, the forward model now applies the *G. ruber*-specific equation of Farmer et al. (2007) (a = 15.4, b = 4.78) for surface simulations, and the *N. dutertrei*-specific equation of Farmer et al. (2007) (a = 14.6, b = 5.09) for thermocline simulations. A choice of equations will be available in the new revised version of the python script. We also performed a sensitivity analysis comparing all equations. For *G. ruber*, the two equations (Bemis et al., 1998 and Farmer et al., 2007) yield a systematic mean offset of ~+0.09‰ ($p < 0.001$), reflecting the difference in the intercept coefficient, while the IFA δ^{18}Oc SD differs by less than 0.005‰ and is statistically indistinguishable at three of four sites (Wilcoxon test, $p > 0.05$). For *N. dutertrei*, the mean offset is ~+0.03–0.04‰ ($p < 0.001$), and the IFA SD is reduced by 0.014–0.020‰ with the Farmer et al. (2007) equation, a difference that is statistically significant ($p < 0.001$) but smaller than the analytical error of δ^{18}Oc measurements (0.08‰) and well below the between-site differences in IFA SD. We therefore conclude that the adoption of species-specific equations does not significantly affect the conclusions of this study, although we agree with the reviewer that using species-specific equations is logical from an ecophysiological point of view.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We now use simulated δ^{18}Oc values computed using species-specific paleotemperature equations (Farmer et al., 2007) in place of the generic Bemis et al. (1998) equation, in **Section 3.1.1, lines 214-218.** Also, we have added a supplementary figure S6 to show the influence of each equation on the simulated δ^{18}Oc.

5) Lines 166–167: The authors apply the Singh et al. (2010) δ18Ow–salinity regression for surface waters. However, this regression mainly reflects northern Indian Ocean conditions influenced by strong riverine freshwater input (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2010.08.002). Please justify its applicability to the study locations. Please also report the R2 value and associated uncertainty.

Our forward-modelling methodology is built around different steps and objectives. As discussed in the paper, in order to forward-model, we need to implement with ORAS5 reanalysis a salinity-δ18Osw equation for the surface and subsurface. The idea is to mimic the different planktonic foraminiferal species which record salinity and temperature signals.

Our framework is divided into two main parts:

1) The first part is to test the sensitivity of each regional site changes in seasonal and interannual variability. In order to have a basis of comparison we need to affect each site by the same coefficient of variability and the same method and equation to calculate the δ18Oc of synthetic IFA. In the first step, a uniform δ18Ow–S relationship is deliberately applied across all sites. This ensures that any differences in the simulated δ18Oc response reflect contrasting local oceanographic conditions alone, rather than equation-dependent offsets.

As a consequence, we chose to apply the same paleotemperature and δ18Osw-S equations for each site to be sure that we test the response in an altered climate under the same parameters and sensitivity. In fact, the Singh et al. (2010) equation likely represents an approximation of the true δ18Ow–S relationship at each site, which may affect how realistically the extrema of variability are reproduced in the synthetic IFA. For this reason, we differentiate this first step with a second one, in which regional equations are used instead. Unlike the first step, this second step is not designed to compare the sensitivity of each site to imposed variability changes; rather, its goal is to best fit the synthetic IFA data to real core- top data, by minimizing the systematic bias introduced by a single generic δ18Ow–S relationship.

2) The second step in our forward-modelling approach aims to show how and at what point the modern data from reanalysis are able or not to reproduce the SD and mean of real IFA of Late Holocene core-tops. In order to be as realistic and precise as possible, site-specific regional δ18Ow–S equations are used to minimize systematic biases when comparing modelled and measured δ18Oc distributions. As a robustness check, we reran the variability sensitivity scenarios (seasonal and interannual, ±75%) using these regional equations at all four sites (Fig. S4). At two sites where the regional slope differs from the uniform value (U1467: 0.28 vs. 0.26; SO189-39KL: 0.16 vs. 0.26), the absolute IFA SD changes significantly (Wilcoxon $p<0.001$; +4.3% and −12.4% respectively, under original conditions), reflecting the direct scaling effect of the δ18Ow–S slope on the salinity-driven component of δ18Oc variance. However, the relative amplitude of the response to imposed climate variability (modified to the original SD ratio) is preserved at both sites confirming that our site ranking by sensitivity to climate variability the main conclusion of this study is robust to the choice of δ18Ow–S equation. In this second step, we do not use the Singh et al., 2010 equation to compared synthetic and real IFA. Instead, we use regional specific equations.

To illustrate the effect of using regional equations even in step one of our frameworks, we used the site- specific equations reported in Section 5.3.3 (Stainbank et al., 2021 for U1467; Thirumalai et al., 2019 for SO189-39KL; LeGrande & Schmidt, 2006 for MD96-2060; Delaygue et al., 2001 for NIOP 905) in place of the uniform Singh et al. (2010) equation, and reran the sensitivity scenarios described above (Fig. S4). The Delaygue et al. (2001) equation used at NIOP 905 shares an identical slope (0.26) with the uniform equation and therefore leaves the IFA SD unchanged at this site, only shifting the mean modelled δ18Oc by the difference in intercept (−8.9 vs. −8). We confirm that the mean modelled δ18Oc shifts consistently with the change in intercept and slope at each site, and that the absolute IFA SD is also affected where the regional slope differs from the uniform one. Critically, the site ranking by sensitivity to seasonal and interannual variability the primary comparison underpinning our conclusions remains unchanged between the two configurations.

Taken together, these results show that while the choice of δ18Ow–S equation has a measurable effect on the absolute IFA SD at some sites, it does not affect the site ranking or the relative amplitude of the sensitivity to climate variability, which is the central comparison of step one. We therefore retain the uniform Singh et al. (2010) derived equation ($\delta18Ow = 0.26 \times S - 8$) for this first step, both as part of the broader simplification strategy underlying our forward-modelling framework, and to ensure direct comparability with the forward-modelling approach of Thirumalai & Clemens (2020) in the Bay of Bengal, who applied this same coastal equation (derived from Singh et al., 2010) in their own forward model. We have clarified this two-step framework explicitly in the revised manuscript with the new framework figure and added the R2 value and associated uncertainties.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added a new figure in supplementary (Figure. S3) to test the influence of using a uniform vs. regional δ^{18}Ow–S equation. We also added a paragraph clearly explaining that we proceed in two different steps with different objectives in our forward-modelling framework, and corrected the associated ΔSD value and figure reference in the same section. **Changes applied in Section 3.1.2, lines 271–277.**

6) Lines 169–171: For subsurface δ18Ow–salinity relationships, the authors use a regression derived from a global dataset. Please show the locations of the water samples used from LeGrande and Schmidt (2006) along with proxy sites in a supplementary figure. Also provide the R2 value and uncertainties in the slope and intercept.

We have added a supplementary figure showing the location of the gridded data points from LeGrande & Schmidt (2006) used to derive the subsurface δ18Ow–S regression. Also, we increase the precision of the regression by adding more data and the resulting equation is $\delta18Ow = 0.449\ (\pm0.003)*S - 15.491\ (\pm0.089)$ ‰, with $R2 = 0.931$. The R2 value and uncertainties on slope and intercept have been added to the manuscript.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have updated the subsurface δ^{18}Ow–S equation in **Section 3.1.1, line 230** with precise coefficients and uncertainties. We also have updated the supplementary figure (Figure. S4) associated.

7) Figure 2: The manuscript suddenly introduces World Ocean Atlas 2023 data, whereas ORAS5 is used throughout the forward modelling. Please use ORAS5 consistently for the depth-wise temperature and salinity plots at all four sites. The selection of 97 m as the thermocline depth appears to rely on WOA23 seasonality. However, the manuscript does not demonstrate how SD of salinity and temperature vary interannually with depth. The rationale for selecting 97 m is therefore not properly justified

Done and text edited in the revised manuscript. The bottom panel shows the vertical structure of temperature SD at each site with a maximum for each site between 75 m and 125 m in the range for the 97 m value already discussed above. Also, the choice is justified by the mean thermocline depths computed from ORAS5 (83.2 ± 30.7 m at MD96-2060, 103.3 ± 37.9 m at NIOP 905, 85.1 ± 17.6 m at U1467, and 90.2 ± 27.2 m at SO189-39KL) (See Specific Comment 3).

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have updated the **Figure 2**, by using now ORAS5 to maintain consistency.

8) Lines 198–200: This section is confusing. In Section 3.1.1, the authors use Singh et al. (2010) for surface waters and LeGrande and Schmidt (2006) for subsurface δ18Ow–salinity relationships. However, in Section 3.1.2, the manuscript refers to the δ18Ow–salinity relationship of Delaygue et al. (2001). Please clarify which relationship was actually used. In reality, δ18Ow–salinity relationships can vary seasonally. The authors should also evaluate how the SD of forward-modelled δ18Oc changes when different δ18Ow–salinity relationships are applied, and justify the use of a constant relationship.

The reference to Delaygue et al. (2001) in Section 3.1.2 concerns the second step of our forward-modelling framework (comparison with IFA core-tops), where region-specific δ18Ow–S relationships are used, drawn from the original regional publications when available or from Delaygue et al. (2001) otherwise. This two-step structure is clarified further in our response to Specific Comment 5.

Regarding the seasonal variability of δ18Ow–S relationships, we agree that these relationships can vary seasonally, particularly in regions strongly influenced by monsoonal freshwater input (Singh et al., 2010). As demonstrated in our sensitivity analysis (see response to Specific Comment 5 and Fig. S4), the choice of δ18Ow–S equation has a measurable but modest effect on the simulated δ18Oc SD, with absolute differences remaining on the order of 0.023 ‰ across sites even though this corresponds to a relative change of up to 12.4% at the most sensitive site (SO189-39KL). Critically, the ranking of sites by sensitivity to imposed climate variability, the central comparison of this study, is preserved regardless of the equation used. The use of a constant relationship for our framework is justified for the reasons detailed in our response to Specific Comment 5.

Author's changes in the manuscript: No additional changes for this part, it refers to the changes of the specific comment 5 made in **Section 3.1.2, lines 271–277.**

9) Lines 203–204: The authors state that "Each individual foraminifera is assumed to record the average monthly environmental conditions of its calcification period." Please provide justification based on the average lifespan of G. ruber and N. dutertrei.

The assumption that each individual foraminifera records the average monthly environmental conditions of its calcification period is justified by the known lifespan of both species. *G. ruber* and *N. dutertrei* have average lifespans of approximately 2–4 weeks (Spero, 1998; Bijma et al., 1990; Jonkers et al., 2015), which is comparable to or shorter than the monthly temporal resolution of the ORAS5 reanalysis used in this study. Under this assumption, each individual is considered to have calcified entirely within a single monthly interval, such that the monthly mean temperature and salinity provide a reasonable approximation of the environmental conditions experienced during calcification. We have added a brief justification to this effect in the revised manuscript (Lines 203–204).

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added in **section 3.1.2, Lines 281-284**, the justification which explains the monthly-averaging assumption is based on the 2-4 week lifespan with some references.

10) Table 1: Please include uncertainties associated with the core-top ages.

Done, we have updated Table 1 by including the uncertainties. All uncertainties are based on 1σ 14C AMS age. For U1467, no 14C AMS age direct dating is available at the core-top level so the age model is based on orbital tuning using the Prob-stack of Ahn et al. (2017), with a sedimentation rate of 8.1 cm/kyr at the core-top.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have updated the **Table 1** with the associated uncertainties.

11) Figure 3: Please include SD values in panels B and D, and discuss them in the interpretation section.

Done, we have added the SD for both panels B and D. At the surface (panel B), interannual SD values in δ18Oc range from ~0.07 ‰ at MD96-2060 in summer to ~0.19 ‰ at U1467 in December, confirming that seasonal variability dominates over interannual variability at all sites. The highest SD are observed for temperature at site NIOP 905 during boreal summer and at site SO189-39KL for salinity throughout the year.

At the thermocline depth (panel D) the SD values are larger, particularly at SO189-39KL (~0.55 ‰) and MD96-2060 (~0.35 ‰), highlighting the greater sensitivity of these sites to interannual forcing. All the results have been discussed in the interpretation section.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have updated the Figure 3B, D with SD values (Bars) and added two descriptive paragraphs in the results **section 4.1.1, lines 397-401; lines 410-414.**

12) Lines 318–320: The authors state that "At sites NIOP 905 and U1467, thermocline variability on interannual timescales is more muted, and seasonal variations in SST and SSS at thermocline depths are larger (Fig. 3D)." However, site NIOP 905 is influenced by the Somali Current. Does the absence of interannual variability in thermocline temperature and salinity imply that the interannual strength of the Somali Current is nearly constant? Is this interpretation supported by instrumental observations?

The phrasing of "more muted" was probably misleading as it could mean an absence of interannual thermocline variability at NIOP 905, which is not the case. Some studies describe the general behaviour of the Somali Current and its variability at large scale or seasonal scale (Beal and Donohue., 2013; Schott & McCreary., 2001) confirming that there is an interannual variability but which is not directly associated with IOD or/and ENSO events. At site NIOP 905, we have also checked in the reanalysis and instrumental dataset the interannual variability in this area. It reveals substantial interannual variability in thermocline temperatures, with a standard deviation of 1.25°C (ORAS5) and 1.47°C (EN4), and maximum anomalies reaching 5.4°C during strong IOD and ENSO events. The

SD of interannual thermocline temperature is highest during boreal summer (JJA: 1.6°C, ORAS5), precisely the season of maximum Somali Current intensity and coastal upwelling along Somalia. It confirms in fact that the interannual variability strength of the Somalian current consistent with our observation.

The original statement referred to the fact that the interannual variability at this site is smaller and "muted" relative to the strong seasonal cycle (~11°C amplitude) and relative to the other thermocline variability observed at SO189-39KL and MD96-2060. We have clarified this in the revised manuscript.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have revised the "more muted" phrasing in **Section 4.1.1, lines 449-452**, to avoid implying an absence of interannual thermocline variability at NIOP 905. We also present interpretation about the Somali Current in the discussion, **Section 5.1, lines 657-660.**

13) Figure 4: It would be easier to follow if the panels were arranged longitudinally from west to east. This would reduce the need for readers to repeatedly identify site locations.

Figure 4 has been reorganized so that panels are arranged from west to east following the longitude of the study sites.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have reordered the Figure 4 with sites from west to east to facilitate the reading.

14) Line 446: Figure 1c represents the annual range of surface-water δ18Oc, not δ18O SD. The figure citation is therefore incorrect.

Done, corrected with the new Fig. 1C

Author's changes in the manuscript: Citation of Fig. 1c is now correct by construction with the corrected new Figure 1 since panels A–C were converted from annual range to standard deviation (see Specific Comment 2). **Section 5.1, Lines 641***: "WAS has a SD significantly higher than all the other sites (Fig. 6), indicating that this area is somehow successfully capturing the expected total variability (Fig. 1C)"*

15) Line 458: Incorrect citation of Figure 6B.

Done, corrected and figure was also range by longitude

Author's changes in the manuscript: Corrected the citation error in **section 4.2, line 599**. Figure 6 panels also reordered west to east, consistent with Figures 4 and other site orderings throughout the manuscript.

16) Lines 527–529: This statement is misleading. Since interannual perturbations were not introduced at the surface, it is unclear how the authors conclude that interannual variability is observed in the surface simulations.

As clarified in the answer to general comment 4, we now update the forward-modelling with the possibility of modifying the interannual variability in the surface. We now present a sensitivity test comparing seasonal-only, interannual-only, and combined perturbations at the surface across all four sites, the results of which have been added to the Supplementary Material. We have revised the manuscript to clarify this distinction and refer to new Supplementary Material.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We revised the sentence in **section 4.1.2, Lines 533-537** to clarify what we have done and refer to the method section and the Supplementary Figure 5. Also, please refer to answer to general comment 4.

17) Lines 547–548: This statement appears overstated. I would describe the agreement between forward-modelled δ18O and core-top IFA δ18O as only partial, with approximately half of the sites showing agreement.

We have revised Lines 547–548 to more accurately reflect the partial nature of the agreement. At Sites MD96-2060, U1467, and SO189-39KL, the forward-modelled and measured IFA SD values are in reasonable agreement (differences < 0.03–0.05‰). However, at Site NIOP 905, the forward model systematically underestimates the measured IFA SD at both surface (synthetic σ = 0.377‰ vs. real σ = 0.565‰) and thermocline depths (synthetic σ = 0.431‰ vs. real σ = 0.526‰).

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have changed the words used to describe the agreement of our data. We use now "Reasonable" and "quite well" in **section 5.3, Lines 787-788.**

Technical comment:

1) Line 74: "Northeastern" appears incorrect; perhaps "northwestern" is intended.

Done

Author's changes in the manuscript: Change applied **Section 1, Line 78.**

Anonymous Referee #2

We thank the Referee #2 for his/her comments. We will address those comments in details in the revised version of our manuscript. We detail below how we will address them point by point.

This is a review of the manuscript by Lichterfeld et al., submitted for consideration for publication in Past Climate. The manuscript investigates seasonal and interannual climate variability and its potential expression in the oxygen isotopic composition (δ18O) of individual surface- and thermocline-dwelling planktonic foraminifera. The authors present new and published single-specimen δ18O data from Globigerinoides ruber and Neogloboquadrina dutertrei collected at four sites across the tropical Indian Ocean and compare these observations with forward-model simulations.

As currently presented, however, the manuscript makes only a limited contribution to our understanding of how seasonal and interannual climate variability is recorded by individual planktonic foraminifera. This is primarily

due to the lack of key observational datasets, as outlined below. With the addition of data that could likely be generated within a reasonable timeframe, the manuscript would be substantially strengthened.

Major comments

1. *The modeled data are compared with late Holocene (0–3.6 kyr BP) individual-foraminifer δ18O data (Fig. 8). In Section 5.3.4, the authors discuss several possible explanations for the discrepancies between modeled and observed data, including temporal integration, sedimentation rates, and the age of the core-top samples. Restricting the comparison to well-dated core-top samples that are younger than approximately 500–700 years would considerably reduce these uncertainties and limit the need for speculative explanations.*

The dating of the MD96-2060 core-top (0-1cm) is clearly affected by bioturbation and/or core-top poor recovery with the old CALYPSO piston device, which makes the core-top mean age of planktonic foraminifera older than those from other cores we compare. This is a major source of uncertainties in studies attempting to calibrate a method using core-top that are not contemporaneous.

Yet the core location, situated in a warm and stratified ocean location poorly affected by changes in seasonality and interannual variability nowadays as compared to other locations is key to have an equatorial background for how modern hydrological parameters will imprint in the isotopic composition of IFA in the warm and low-saline western equatorial region of the Indian Ocean.

Contrarily to regions where cores were collected South or North of our site (i.e. the eddy-driven surface circulation of the Mozambique channel and the Somalian upwelling, respectively) are affected by an upper ocean dynamic much more active than in MD96-2060. We are aware of another sediment piston core situated offshore with analogous hydrological parameters (MD96-2062), but the onboard preliminary analysis (core description, magnetic susceptibility and sedimentary reflectance) indicates a sedimentary gap at around 4 meters depth (https://doi.org/10.17600/96200060).

We stated in length in the article that the real core-top is not modern, but other downcore measurements of geochemical parameters indicate as well that the core is mostly unaffected by other sedimentary problems downcore (https://www.seanoe.org/data/01016/112750/). As the Holocene $\delta^{18}O$ values of *G. ruber* is mostly constant in more dynamical sites situated North (Ganssen et al., 2011) and South (Wang et al., 2013) we have confidence in the core-top IFA values as reliable anchors while testing the applicability of IFA for past different climate backgrounds (see below).

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added a paragraph in the discussion, in **Section 5.3.4, lines 960-967** following the sentence above.

2. *A major weakness of the manuscript is the absence of measured (observational) individual-foraminifer δ18O data from climatic intervals other than the late Holocene. For example, generating comparable datasets for the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) from sites MD06-2060 and SO189-39KL and directly comparing the LGM and Holocene records would provide a valuable test of the sensitivity and broader applicability of the proposed approach. Such a comparison would substantially strengthen the manuscript.*

Indeed, a following article precisely targeting the LGM is almost ready for submission. As the interpretation in terms of LGM Indian Ocean variability is a long story on its own, we decided to publish that calibration exercise in advance to ease the discussion of the second paper that needs this first paper to be published. We are happy to see that the reviewer is willing to read the paleo-story IFA, that will be submitted as soon as this article is in press.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added a sentence at the end of the **conclusion, line 1023** to hint at forthcoming IFA work on the Indian Ocean.

- *The assumed habitat depth of 0.5 m for G. ruber is not supported by several observational studies.*

We already addressed this point in detail in our response to Referee #1. We agree that a fixed calcification depth of 0.5 m is a simplification of the habitat depth range of *G. ruber*. To assess this, we turned to stratified plankton-net data from the FORCIS database (Chaabane et al., 2023) which show that *G. ruber* consistently stays concentrated within the upper 50 m of the water column. This supports a near-surface calcification depth overall, though we recognize that 0.5 m itself is still a simplification rather than a tightly constrained ecological depth. We also tested the sensitivity of our forward model comparing simulations run at a fixed depth versus over a fixed 0–50 m layer. The two approaches yield no significant difference in standard deviation ($\Delta SD < 0.065‰$ at most sites), showing that our results hold up well against this simplification. We will clarify and discuss this point further in the revised manuscript.

Author's changes in the manuscript: **No specific changes,** this point is addressed by the same manuscript additions covering Referee #1's General Comment 6 (FORCIS habitat-depth discussion, Section 5.3.2) and General Comment 2 (fixed-depth vs. layer sensitivity test, Section 3.1.1, Supplementary Fig. S2).

- *What is the basis for the assumption that an individual foraminifer records monthly averaged environmental conditions?*

This assumption is justified by the assumed 2–4-week lifespan of both *G. ruber* and *N. dutertrei* (Spero, 1998; Schiebel and Hemleben, 2017), which is consistent with lunar-period cycle reproduction (Bijma et al., 1990). Moreover, this lifespan is shorter than or comparable to the monthly resolution of the ORAS5 reanalysis used for the forward-modelling such that each individual is considered to calcify within a single monthly interval. We have added this clarification in the revised manuscript (Section 3.1.2).

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have added justification in Section 3.1.2, lines 291-294, citing the 2–4 week lifespan of *G. ruber* and *N. dutertrei* (Spero, 1998; Schiebel and Hemleben, 2017) and lunar-paced reproduction (Bijma et al., 1990; Jonkers et al., 2015).

- *Page 10 (line 265): Dissolution is discussed and largely dismissed as a possible explanation for the observed δ18O variability. SEM images documenting shell preservation would strengthen this conclusion.*

Other cores collected further South in more regions prone to calcite dissolution because of higher surface productivity indicate SEM images with pristine calcite, with clearly apparent foraminifera spines (Wang et al., 2013). We are aware of only two records where dissolution affect significantly the oxygen isotopes, one in the much more corrosive Pacific Ocean (Wu & Berger, 1989) and North of the productive Somali Basin (Schmiedl & Mackensen, 2006), despite the fact that the Pacific Ocean is probably affected by biologically-mediated calcite dissolution (Schulte & Bard, 2003). Of course, SEM images would be an additional argument to discard dissolution as a potential artifact, but foraminifera were hand-picked and very good preservation was already observed, with limited foraminifera fragments (Adebayo et al., 2025) showing a very low fragmentation index (3%) at MD96-

2060, among the best-preserved core- tops of their dataset. We will hence probably not invest in further SEM for that analysis.

Author's changes in the manuscript: As explained above, no new SEM image will be added. We support this argument by adding a paragraph presenting these points in **Section 3.2, lines 370–374.**

- *Figure 5: The standard deviation values are incorrectly formatted. Replace commas with decimal points (e.g., 0.276 instead of 0,276).*

It will be done in the revised manuscript.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We have corrected Figure 5; all axis labels and σ values now use decimal points for both panels.

- *Page 17 (line 448): Based on the figure, I estimate a temperature amplitude of approximately 6 °C rather than the 8.5 °C reported in the text. Please verify this value.*

It will be done in the revised manuscript. We checked using the ORAS5 monthly SST reanalysis (1958–2018) at this site and confirm that the value in the text conflated the total range of the monthly Ime series, which includes interannual variability (ΔSST = 8.7 °C), with the seasonal SST amplitude shown in Fig. 3 (mean monthly cycle only), which is 5.6 °C consistent with the referee's estimate. We have corrected the text to report the seasonal amplitude of 5.6 °C.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We corrected the value from 8.5 °C to 5.6 °C in **section 5.2, line 700.**

- *Figure 7: For improved readability, use more distinct colors to differentiate decreasing salinity from decreasing temperature. The same recommendation applies to increasing salinity and increasing temperature.*

It will be done in the revised manuscript.

Author's changes in the manuscript: We revised the colours in the figure 7, using four maximally distinct, colourblind-safe colour palette.

Community Comment #1

General comments

Very good research on paleoclimate that proposes an isotopic approach. Follow my guidelines to improve the manuscript.

Specific comments

Line 61. “Traditional δ18O paleoclimate analysis methods focus on reconstructing average climate conditions”. Statement which is not backed-up be references. Please, insert general references on traditional δ18O approaches to paleoclimate studies:

- Lécuyer, C., Allemand, P. 1999. Modelling of the oxygen isotope evolution of seawater: implications for the climate interpretation of the δ18O of marine sediments. Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta, 63(3-4), 351-361.

- Medici G, Marianelli D, Cornacchia I, Gori F, Brandano M 2026. Multi-disciplinary approach to paleokarst occurrence in the Eocene–Oligocene succession of the Apulia Carbonate Platform (Salento, Italy). Facies, 72(2), 17.

We thank the author of this comment for their positive assessment of our work and for this comment. Our manuscript already presents a substantial number of references on general traditional $\delta^{18}O$ approaches, as well as references specific to the IFA $\delta^{18}O$ method applied to different regions to reconstruct past climate variability. We respectfully note that the two references suggested by the reviewer (Lécuyer & Allemand, 1999; Medici et al., 2026) do not directly relate the use of $\delta^{18}O$ of planktonic foraminifera as a palaeoclimate proxy especially with IFA method and we therefore consider our existing citations at this point of the manuscript to be more directly relevant.

Author's changes in the manuscript: No change made to the manuscript as explained above.

Specific comments

Line 78. Clarify the general aim or principal research question of your paleoclimate research.

Line 78. They look more specific objectives than the steps of a workflow. I would use the term “specific objectives” at the end of your introduction.

Line 89. “Regional water dynamics”. Define the ranges for the spatial scale of your regional movement of water-masses.

Line 685. Link your sedimentation rate to your specific paleoenvironment / sedimentary environment in this paragraph. If you are clear about that, you could the attract more attention from the audience.

Lines 685-720. I would delete empty lines (e.g., 690).

Thanks for the suggestions. We clarify the general aim and specific objectives of the study at the end of the introduction. Regarding "regional water dynamics," we will specify that this refers to the water-mass dynamics local to each of our four core sites, rather than to basin-wide Indian Ocean circulation.

Author's changes in the manuscript: The objectives are described at the end of the introduction, **Section 1, lines 82.** We already present the environment for each site and describe the regional influences as we made changes for the general comment 5 of the referee #1.

Figures and tables

There are issues on resolution on several figures. I will be more specific below.

Figure 2. Letters and numbers on the axes of all the three graphs are too small. There is room for improvement.

Figures 3-5. Same scenario for these for these graphs.

Figure 6. Increase the graphic resolution maybe rising the dpi. Some words and numbers are difficult to read.

Figure 7. Do you need to show equations for the correlation lines?

Figure 7. Legend and words/numbers on axes are difficult to read.

Thanks for the comment, we have improved the legibility and quality of the figures.

Author's changes in the manuscript: Most of the figures were revised following multiple comments from all referees.