

Reviewer 2 Comments and Responses

Minor Comment - Figure 5c and d: Why do you choose Years 130-150 to calculate EIS response rather than the full 150 years? Since you are studying the cloud feedback, why not showing the EIS response normalized by the global-mean surface temperature change?

Thank you for pointing out this inconsistency. We have revised the bottom two panels of Figure 4 as you suggested, where the EIS responses are normalized by the global mean surface temperature response for further parity to cloud feedbacks. We chose to use the latter 20 years of the Abrupt-4xCO₂ experiment as the response (relative to the control experiment) as it would bring out the strongest signal given the more positive surface temperature response by the end of the simulation. Using all 150 years could potentially mask this signal given the lack of response in the first few decades relative to the control period.

Minor comment - I feel the abbreviation 'CFP' is slightly strange because it is never used in the community as far as I know. Why not keep it as the 'cloud feedback parameter' or lambda?

All instances of the term 'CFP' have been replaced with the full term— net climate feedback parameter.

Technical Revisions

All technical revisions you have pointed out have been rectified, thank you for pointing these out.