

Responses to reviewers comments:

Cirano et al., A description of existing Operational Ocean Forecasting Services around the Globe

On behalf of the co-authors, I would like to thank the Topic Editor (TE) comments that have been well received and acted upon. Please see, in blue, our responses to each comment that have significantly improved this manuscript.

We would like to emphasize that, in the revised manuscript, we have highlighted all modifications and additions in blue. We chose this approach because the tracked changes version made the text difficult and confusing to read.

Summary:

The authors are to be commended for their considerable efforts in compiling and synthesizing information on all operational ocean systems in this comprehensive review. After a thorough review of the authors' responses and the revised manuscript, I believe they have done an excellent job of addressing the reviewers' concerns. I have suggested some minor revisions for the authors to consider in the final version.

Thank you for your positive feedback and for guiding the review process. We appreciate your thoughtful comments and have carefully addressed the suggested minor revisions in the final version of the manuscript. A brief summary of the changes is included for your reference.

Comments:

Comment 1 - Abstract

All suggestions made by the TE were incorporated in the revised manuscript.

Comment 2 - Table 1

The name "MRI.COM/MOVE-G3" was replaced by "MOVE-JPN" in the revised manuscript.

Comment 3 - penultimate paragraph of section 3.1 Regional and Coastal Forecasts

The suggested phase was incorporated in the revised manuscript.

Comments 4 and 5 - last paragraph of section 3.1 Regional and Coastal Forecasts

"Defense" was replaced by "defense" and the suggested phase was incorporated at the end of this paragraph in the revised manuscript.

Comments 6 and 7 - antepenultimate paragraph of section 9.1 Regional systems

The verb “has been developed” was replaced by “has developed” and “ocean, fire smoke dispersion” was replaced by “ocean and fire smoke dispersion” in the revised manuscript.

Comment 8 - Table 2

Thank you for your feedback. We understand the desire for conciseness. Regarding the table, we feel it offers a unique level of detail that supports and expands upon the findings discussed in the text. We were hoping to retain it in the revised manuscript to provide a more comprehensive picture for the reader. We are open to further discussion if you have specific concerns about its content or placement.

Comment 9 - penultimate paragraph of section 11 Conclusions

The term “Decade Collaborative Centre” was replaced by its acronym in the revised manuscript.

Comment 10 - acronyms “CMCC CMEMS MFS” and the “INGV MFS”

TE is correct, the revised manuscript only uses the acronyms “MFS” and “INGV MFS” now.