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Comment 1: I appreciate the description of the numerical experiment in Tab. 3. This is, certainly, a good way to summarize the faced setting. However, I think that the authors need to improve the model description in the section 2.4. In particular, it is necessary to integrate the experiment 1 section because is not clear how to justify the benchmark parameter and then, the calibration is not clear explained. I think that many information can be deduced from Nan 2021 but it is better for the reader to have an integration. Similar considerations can be achieved for the correction of precipitation (c.ca Line 601, iGCM).

Response 1: Thank you very much for your appreciation and suggestion. We will add more descriptions about the model, calibration and iGCM correction in the revised manuscript.

Comment 2: Fig. 1 I suggest to remove the connection lines between the three figures. Then, I suggest to include the geographical info of Fig.1a and c inside the figure (similar to fig. 1b).

Response 2: Thanks for your suggestion. We think the connection lines between figures are necessary to present the relationship between the three figures, but we will reduce the width of the lines to make the figure more beautiful.

I suppose you mean to include the legend of Figure 1a and b inside figure similar to Figure 1c. We will adjust the figure according to your suggestion in the revised manuscript.

Comment 3: Line 297-298 maybe you miss the word “precipitation” after the first “isotope”.

Response 3: Thanks for your comment. We will add the missing word in the revised manuscript.