

Dear Dr. Andrews,

We have received three thoughtful reviews of “*Extratropical teleconnections in a multi-model ensemble nudged towards the observed QBO*” (WCD 2026-737). The ball is now in your court to post your response to how you and your co-authors intend to respond to these three reviews. In the way of some guidance, I note that all three reviewers have significant concerns that must be addressed in a revised manuscript for it to be publishable in WCD.

Regards, David Battisti

PS. I include below some of my own comments on the manuscript.

Editor’s additional comments:

Figure 2: what months are included in “mid-winter”?

Line 270 and elsewhere: Please provide information on how the BCs differ; how the experimental periods differ; how the models changed. Have they all changed? Are some of the models used in phase 2 identical to that used in phase1? If so, which ones?

Line 285: what is meant by significant? Statistically significant? If so, at what level?

Line 330: please also state the regression coefficient for the models and for observations.

Lines 339-41: Rather than look at the relationship in the MMM, perhaps a better indication of how well the models are doing is to string together the time series from all models and then correlate the PNJ with the QBO.

Line 390-91: How different are the SSW frequencies in the warm vs. cold phases of ENSO. Please quantify this (in observations and models) by calculating the p value for the difference between two means, taking into account the number of events in QBOE and QBOW. Put 2 sigma uncertainty bars on the mean values for the ERA results, for the ALL ENSO and La Nina cases.

Lines 388-395 and figure 8. In addition to what is shown in this figure, you might consider looking at the difference between the SSW frequencies in QBOE and QBOW for each model, and then plot the model spread in the difference. If it is interesting, you could plot this as panel b in figure 8 (or simply add more columns to the existing figure, but that might be confusing).

Figure 12 is difficult to read. Please split the figure into panel a (Exp1) and panel b (Exp1-ObsQBO) so we can see the difference.

Figure 14 and the discussion. I agree with Anonymous Reviewer #2. This figure is very difficult to read, and correlations are very likely not significant. I strongly recommend you remove this figure and the related discussion.