

Review of “Southern hemisphere anticyclonic circulation drives climatic conditions and sea surface temperatures in southernmost Africa” (re-submitted) by Hahn et al.

I am generally satisfied by the authors’ addressing of both my main and my minor suggestions.

I have one pending issue related to the scientific content of the paper: in the conclusions the authors include a short sentence about the possibility of paleo scenarios replicating due to climate change. I think this is not by any means well articulated in the paper, and should be discussed to some extent, either in the (end of the) discussion, or in the conclusions. It is critical for the reader to know that it is actually suggested: precisely what scenario may replicate, and why should we think that this is plausible, given what is known about present and future climate change (ITCZ displacement, circulation patters changing,...).

Last, I suggest the authors should pay close attention in revising the writing, as this seems to still require attention. I will use the most outstanding parts of the article to exemplify the type of issues that should be checked:

- Title: I leave this ultimately to the authors and the editor, but isn’t it misleading to use the present tense to refer to past phenomena? I would use “drove Holocene climate” (so also the timeframe is specified) instead of “drive”.
- Abstract: I don’t see a real “contrast” between “climatic conditions favorable to torrential flood events” on the one hand, and “lower sea surface temperatures” and “humid conditions” on the other.
- Abstract line 18: I don’t see the need to use the resounding word “unique”.
- Abstract line 28: wrong verb conjugation. In general verb tenses are switched seemingly randomly throughout the abstract, i.e., events of the past are referred to in either present or past tense (e.g. lines 23-30). Please correct this (also check the rest of the manuscript).
- Conclusion line 34: not sure whether “The down-core GeoB18308-1” can be considered the subject of a sentence.
- Conclusion line 36: it seems like the LIA continues until present.
- Conclusion line 38-39: this seems a repetition of lines 28-29
- Conclusion line 1 (second page): it doesn’t seem useful to introduce acronyms in the conclusions.