

Review Shi

Overall rating: The authors have responded to the reviewers' comments and suggestions in an adequate way and have improved substantially the manuscript. In particular, they have provided better information on the statistical methods and have tuned down a bit their conclusion on a connection between their correlation indices to the Atlantic Multidecadal Variability. Rather, they make a clear and well-funded statement that the variations in the EASM/precipitation is an expression of internal variability, not a result of external forcing. This is an important finding for the interpretation of proxy records of different kinds. I recommend that the paper should be accepted for publication in CP after some minor revisions.

The authors have included more information from the CESM Last Millennium Ensemble (LME). However, this could be extended a bit in discussing the uncertainty regarding the single model results. For example, Figure 2c should be discussed further in connection with Figure S3 (which shows the same thing as far as I understood). In the LME runs, (fig. S3) the individual members show dramatic differences (3-4 with positive sign, 4-5 with negative sign). If such a distribution was representative for ensembles from the other models, one would have to conclude that the findings from individual runs (Fig. 2c) could be just by chance. I would also suggest providing a Taylor diagram figure in the supplement (as Fig. 1b) for the CESM LME.

Minor issues:

Page 3, ln 31: better: nine CESM-LME full-forcing experiment, one control experiment, and several sensitivity experiments with individual forcing (...)

Page 6, ln 24ff: the "obvious" depends a bit on the view of the reader. In many simulations the 100-200 year periods are much more prominent than the 40-60 years. The authors play the lower-frequency a bit down, but it is very prominent when looking just at the RPC time series from, e.g, MPI-ESM-P.

Page 7, ln 15ff. along the same line: the 120-150 year period is prominent both in the inforced control run and the MME. Is there any evidence from other analyses of the LME where this comes from?

Page 8, ln 1ff: The fact that AMO is more consistent among ensemble members implies that AMO is more directly influenced by external forcing. This issue is discussed in a manuscript on a recent reconstruction of the AMO (Wang et al Nature Geosciences, 2017, doi:10.1038/ngeo2962), which could be included here.