

Editorial Review:

The authors have partly revised this manuscript and addressing the primary concerns from the first round of review. However, the quality of the current manuscript suffers from careless editing and severe formatting oversights. Important sections contain blatant text duplications, and the figure numbering system is broken and redundant.

1) There is a clear duplication of text in Section 2.1 (Data). The paragraph starting at line 73 ("For the analysis in this article, we use the 1981-2016 hindcast period with cross validation...") is almost entirely repeated in the next paragraph starting at line 80 ("For the analysis in this article, we use the 1981-2016 hindcast period with cross validation..."). This level of duplication is unprofessional and must be eliminated immediately by merging the text and removing all redundancies.

We thank the reviewer for pointing out this issue. The duplicated paragraph was inadvertently left in during the revision process. The duplicate has been removed, and the section has been edited to eliminate the redundancy.

2) The numbering of figures is completely chaotic. The main text contains Figures 1 to Figures 11 (Pages 8 to 21). However, starting on Page 28, the figure numbering completely resets, creating a second, identical sequence of "Figure 1" through "Figure 5". If the second set of figures belongs to an Appendix or Supplementary Material, they must be labeled as such (e.g., Figure A1, A2). If they belong to the main body, they must follow a continuous, sequential order (from Figure 12 onward). The entire text referencing must be cross-checked and fixed.

We thank the reviewer for pointing out this issue. The figures at the end of the manuscript belong to the appendix. They have now been renumbered as Figures A1–A5, and the appendix has been reorganized to improve its readability. In addition, we carefully checked all figure references throughout the manuscript and corrected them where necessary.