

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

We are very happy and honoured to get our work accepted at WCD and are hoping to publish again with WCD and Copernicus in the future. We thank Prof. Dr. Heinli Wernli, and Prof. Dr. Daniela Domeisen for acting as editors, the three independent referees and the people at Copernicus, involved in the revision of our manuscript for their valuable time and work. Especially, since this review process has been longer than one year. We are very grateful for the patience and understanding regarding the needed deadline extensions and are very satisfied with the final outcome and conclusions of the paper.

In the following we provide our last comments and changes

### Editor Comments

*In the captions of Figs. 3 and 4, it would be good to mention whether you consider here the 98<sup>th</sup> percentile in the region SGer or CPM; just add "... for the 98-percentile most severe precipitation case in the region XXX ..."*

It is region SGer. It has been included

*You deleted the misleading sentence ""Either RCM or CPM can show these large differences ..." but there is a similarly strange formulation still in the conclusions on L535: "Composite maps derived from the leading modes showed that either RCM or CPM can represent daily precipitation differences as large as 200 m d<sup>-1</sup>, although CPM tends to simulate larger precipitation than RCM over the mountains." Again, "either A or B can represent differences" is not very meaningful. And also the unit should most likely be mm/d, not m/d. Maybe best to also delete this entire sentence? Or phrase in a better way?*

We replace that sentence for another phrase, similar to what is said in the abstract.

*"Composite maps derived from the leading modes showed that CPM systematically represents more precipitation at the mountain tops, but that RCM may show large intensities (up to 200 mm d<sup>-1</sup>) in other regions."*