

## Author reply to the Editor (wcd-2022-11)

We thank the editor, Prof. Dr. Heinli Wernli for his very helpful comments and indications. We hope we have addressed all remaining concerns, especially those dealing with the English style and composition. The manuscript has been revised by the two senior co-authors as suggested, and the mentioned paragraphs and issues were re-written.

### Editor Comments

*1) reviewer 2 commented about Section 7.3: "I think these paragraphs need to be rewritten. They read like notes rather than actual paragraphs, also I am confused what the underpinning message is." You changed the sentences a bit but I think the problem remains that this section reads like a collection of statements and does not provide a clear message. After I read all these very short paragraphs I was overwhelmed and confused by the details and did not know what I should get from this. I have the impression that you repeat here too many details that are not so relevant (e.g., low CAPE in winter is maybe clear anyway?). Instead, you should focus on a few key points and combine them to 1 or 2 nice paragraphs. Or you completely delete this section.*

We agree that the composition of this section was not clear. It has been fully rewritten, reducing the extension from 1.5 pages to 0.5 pages and the last figure (former Fig. 13) has been removed. This has been done to avoid redundant information and unnecessary details. We hope it reads more clearly now. Please refer to the track changes version to see the differences.

*2) Please have again a very careful look at your English (find a senior colleague who has time to work through the text once again). For instance, in L35 "Regarding surface temperature RCM simulates up to 2 °C more than CPM ..." does not sound very nice, please improve. Why not just "Surface temperatures in RCM are up to 2 degC higher than in CPM"? Similarly on L532. And I don't understand in L14 "not all implications of reaching CPM are known" ... There are many sentences that could/should be written a bit more elegantly and clearly. I emphasise this because it was already mentioned twice by the reviewers.*

We have revised the style and the English language of the text. Please refer to the track changes version to see the differences.

*3) Please also carefully check formatting issues: units should not be in italics (e.g., L13), avoid typos (L23), exponents should be properly formatted (L497 and in other places), "Winter" should not be capitalised (L543), etc.*

We have corrected these issues.

*4) The huge precipitation differences you mention in L28, are they for a particular day or in the climatology, this is unclear.*

They refer to specific heavy precipitation events. It has been rephrased in the new version of the manuscript.

*5) L29: The sentence "Either RCM or CPM can show these large differences ..." does not make sense because one model alone does not produce "differences"*

We agree with the comment. It has been rephrased.