Dear Dr. Li et al.

Based on two reviewers’ comments on your article titled “Combined Impacts of ENSO and MJO on the 2015 Growing Season Drought over the Canadian Prairies”, I am happy to say that final acceptance will take place, if you are able to address the reviewers’ comments and suggestions - major revisions are required. Both reviewers have some excellent points and all of them can be reasonably addressed. I only point out some of the more major comments (and commonalities) below, however, each of the reviewer’s points should be addressed as well.

We thank the editor and the two reviewers’ valuable comments and advices to improve the original draft. Many improvements have been made to the draft according to the suggestion by the reviewers.

1) Both reviewers point out many typographical and grammatical errors. Please read over the manuscript carefully and make appropriate edits. One reviewer provided their marked-up manuscript to assist with this, as well as other comments requiring edits.

We have revised the draft accordingly to correct these errors.

2) Does the study period span 1979-2015 or 1979-2016?

The study period spans 1979-2016.

3) Manitoba is not included in the analysis. Hence, the title of the manuscript requires changing.

We have changed the title to “Combined Impacts of ENSO and MJO on the 2015 Growing Season Drought over western and central Canadian Prairies”.

4) B.C. was not included in the analysis, but does appear to be affected. One reviewer is suggesting inclusion of B.C. or explaining why it was not included.

We choose to focus on the Prairie drought due to the fact the majority of the precipitation occur in summer for the Prairie whereas for BC coast the precipitation mainly occurs in winter. Though the precipitation deficit percent is high for BC coast. We have added some comments in the data section.

5) More quantitative analysis of the relation between Rossby waves and the drought should be addressed where possible.

We have added more analysis in terms of wave propagation.

6) Reviewer #2 suggests adding some detail about the unexplained drought events under NINO4>0 and MJO-4<0 (in the shaded region in Fig. 5), while connecting these events to the previously proposed teleconnection mechanisms in the introduction. At least some discussion should be made here.

We have added more discussions on the drought under NINO4>0 and MJO-4<0 and La Nina events.

7) The MJO-4 and ENSO are likely not independent. Some discussion of this should be made.

We have added discussions on the relationship between MJO and ENSO in the discussion section.

Once you have addresses each of the reviewer’s comments, your manuscript will be considered for final publication.