

General comment:

Thank you for your thorough answers and explanations. The applied methods are clearer now. I have only one comment regarding my previous comment 5 about why there are more cyclones in LR.

Recommendation:

Acceptance after minor revisions

previous comment 5)

Thanks for your answer to this comment and the additional figures. This large bias reduction from LR to HR only in initialized predictions compared to a neglectable bias reduction from LR to HR in free running experiments is surely an interesting result. It is important for the reader to know that the reason why there are so many more cyclones in LR is due to initialization. That's why I strongly encourage to add your figure 5 from the responses (Initialized Pre-Op minus un-initialized Pre-Op) to the manuscript.

The question why this large bias in LR remains.

The provided explanation of "systematically too low pressure over the North Atlantic" is not sufficient. Lower pressure at the downstream end of the stormtrack goes along with more cyclones.

Please either

A) comment on why the difference in LR between initialization and no-initialization will not be further investigated in this study

B) discuss potential reasons. This will require additional analyses.

The most obvious reason seems to be related to the role of the ocean in the gulf stream region. Note also the differences in stormtrack and windstorm frequency between LR and HR in this region.

The focus of the manuscript is forecast years 2-5. Looking at the differences in drift between LR and HR both in SST and cyclone frequency might help.

Technical comments:

i) P7L33: "blocking_2d/detail" should be "blocking/detail"

ii) P11L3: delete "and Canada"

iii) P11L11ff: when including the above mentioned figure this paragraph has to be revised

iv) P11L26: replace "eligible"

v) P16L15: correct "persits"