

Reviewer #2 Evaluations:

Recommendation: Return to author for minor revisions

Significant: Yes, the paper is a significant contribution and worthy of prompt publication.

Supported: Yes

Referencing: Yes

Quality: Yes, it is well-written, logically organized, and the figures and tables are appropriate.

Data: Yes

Accurate Key Points: Yes

Reviewer #2 (Formal Review for Authors (shown to authors)):

The paper has been substantially revised in response to the two reviews, which raised a number of common concerns with the original version. The paper now reads much better and provides a more balanced and useful perspective. I am happy to recommend publication, although I noted a number of typographical errors in Table 1 which should be corrected:

Thank you for your valuable comments. Our responses to your comments are presented in bold.

1. The entry "Extratropical cyclone activity" does not indicate the nature of the trend (i.e. increase or decrease)

We added “weakening” to indicate the nature of the trend.

2. The 11th row (the one citing Shaw et al. (2022) and Cox et al. (2024)) is blank for the first two columns

We added “Storm track strengthening (eddy kinetic energy)” and “S. Hemisphere Zonal-mean” for the first two columns.

3. The row on weakening of upward vertical motion lists "upward motion" as the region

We revised the text to “Global”.

4. The penultimate row is incomplete and anyway seems like a repeat of the row three lines earlier

We removed the repeated row.