

Response to reviewers

We would like to thank the reviewer for their additional comments on the paper, which we address below.

Reviewer 1

line 97: "assessing the risk in the southern hemisphere": the risk of what? please clarify

Text changed to read "assessing the chance of southern hemisphere sudden warmings and associated risk of extreme hot/dry conditions in austral subtropical continents".

line 197: typo: "a similar results"

Fixed.

Figure 9: it is a bit confusing how red and blue mean different things for different factors, i.e. upper or lower tercile or wave-2 vs wave-1. would it be possible to use e.g. different colors for these or to add a legend to the figure that would clarify this?

Agreed, thank you. We have changed the colours corresponding to wave-2 vs wave-1.

line 411: "It is also therefore weak when considering the responses when averaged over the full 30d period." I think this sentence could be clarified a bit more, e.g. clarify what "it" refers to.

Text clarified.

line 457: "in dedicated modelling" change to "in dedicated modelling studies"

Changed.

line 465: would only use the word "significant" when meaning "statistically significant". if that's what is meant here then please keep it

Changed to "potentially extreme".

line 469: if you'd like to cite a study that uses initialized models for the MJO teleconnection to the stratosphere, could use this one: <https://journals.ametsoc.org/view/journals/bams/103/6/BAMS-D-21-0130.1.xml>

Thank you – now cited.