Thanks for the author's effort in revising the manuscript. However, most comments were not well addressed.

First, the authors said the E3SMv1 can reproduce the atmospheric anomalies related to the two types of El Nino events in the observations. However, I cannot find the evidences. Actually, the authors only show the climatological distributions of DJF mean 10-m wind speed and relative humidity (Figure S3).

Second, as indicated in my previous comment, the results should be sensitive to the selected model. We cannot confirm the robustness of the results. We can obtain different conclusion if using other climate models. Actually, previous studies indicated that El Nino event cannot lead to notable climate and atmospheric anomalies over the regions to the north of China.

Third, the authors did not explain the mechanisms for the differences of the atmospheric anomalies over North China between different types of El Nino.

Fourth, as indicated in previous comment, in my view, the simulated atmospheric circulation anomalies over East Asia show notably different with those in the observations. I did not think they are similar.

Fifth, I do not think 3 ensemble and 10 years mean can well remove the internal atmospheric variability in mid-latitude regions, although the authors suggested that the model response to different types of El Niño events outweighs the effect of the internal variability of the model.

Deser C, Phillips AS, Alexander MA, Smoliak BV (2014) Projecting North American climate over the next 50 years: uncertainty due to internal variability. J Clim 27(6):2271–2296.