

Dear Editor Prof. Camenisch,

We very appreciate the two referees for giving us precious comments. We have finalized all corrected point by point. Thank you for accepting our hard works. Our response are listed in this letter.

Referee #1

1. New text has been inserted between lines 52 and 75 in section 1. The new text now disrupts the flow of the introduction. I would urge the authors to review the text for clarity – this is the most important part of the manuscript, and now doesn't really do the study justice.

An: We seriously rewrote the line 52-77 and move a section to line 81-91. We hope our revised for more clarity and sentences smother.

2. Table 1 (page 3) would be better titled 'Illustrative quotations from selected historical sources in China'.

An: Yes, we have done in line 132.

3. Sections 5.2 and the new 5.3 contain passages where the degree of association between variables is perhaps overstated. For example, on lines 351-352, the text reads "This phenomenon indicates a close link between TC activity and..." I would suggest that the word "link" is replaced with "association" to soften the understanding of the relationship. The same occurs in line 372 where the word "proves" is used – this is very strong. You might rephrase the text to read: "This result suggests that the NAO influences..." I would urge the authors to check the remainder of the text for overly strong linkages.

An: Yes, we revised in line 358 and line 379-380.

Referee #2

Just one suggestion, could the authors list the records of tropical cyclones in the Supporting Information? This will help the audiences to use the data and make this paper with more impacts. The authors should include more details to introduce the process of quantifying the historical records into the number.

An: We listed all data in "Supporting files" and new table for illustrations. Maybe the referee didn't find the file on system. ([cp-2018-86-supplement-version3.pdf](#))

