

Response to the Editor

We would like to thank the Editor for his second review, and respond concisely and brief as requested:

Crueger and Stevens (2015, JAMES) has been added to citation (L92). However, here also only a single “whole” process (cloud–radiative feedback) is turned off in this study.

An outline of the paper has been added at the end of introduction (L108–109)

The title of Sec. 2 has been modified into: Model, Forecast, Cases and Analysis Procedure.

Sec. 2.2 has been put before Sec. 2.1.

A reference to Sec. 2.1 (previous Sec.2.2) has been added where IFA is introduced as a model for analyses (L38)

To aid the interpretation of Fig. 1, the phrase “as identified as negative signals (in blue) stretching from the upper–left to the lower–right” has been added (L140–141).

Fig. 1 caption modified

L146, ‘as expected from the nonlinear free-Rossby wave theory’: a reference to Wang *et al.* (2019) has been added, in which further discussion are found about the Gill solution.

L144 (L150), “MJO events” → “MJO event”

L440–448: we agree with the statement ‘better forecast for the wrong reasons’

General comment: To be discussed further, but we note that there are 70 Million matches when one enters in Google “the merits of single case studies”, and notable attributes are given “as empirically-rich, context-specific, holistic accounts that they have to offer, and their contribution to theory-building”. Notwithstanding that statistical significance cannot be claimed, our aim is the former.

All the other modifications have been made as suggested.