

Response to Editor Olivier Marti:

We highly appreciate your positive reminders and suggestions to make corresponding changes in the manuscript about Fig. 11. Our detailed response is listed below.

Comment: Thank you for your responses to the reviewers and the revised manuscript. They address all the points raised by the reviewers in a convincing manner. I still have a little concern. You made a long response to reviewer #2 about Fig. 11. But you didn't change the manuscript accordingly. Could put a phrase in Fig. 11 caption to explain of the trajectories are slightly different even though the difference is too small to be seen on the plot? I really feel that it would be better if it's in the legend.

Reply: We agree with the editor. We added the corresponding descriptions to explain the differences in the trajectories shown in Figure 11 at Lines 411-414 in the manuscript: **“The abrupt track difference after 42th hour is most likely caused by the continuous accumulation of the direct cloud-radiation process and the systematic temperature bias in the typhoon peripheral cloud area during the re-undergone spin-up of G00 experiment, along with their impacts on the typhoon eye (track) through dynamic processes with the model integration.”**.