

Thank you for carefully taking most of my previous comments into account and revising the manuscript accordingly. The revised manuscript is certainly improved. The reorganisation of the structure and the rephrasing / clearer explanation of the machine learning terminology certainly helped. I have a few minor comments remaining:

- The revisions made to the manuscript in an attempt to address my previous major comment #2 (“Limitations of the method should be clearly highlighted) are quite well hidden in the manuscript and only amount to a few added sentences. I am of the opinion that the limitations should be highlighted in the conclusions section as well.
- Section 2.1 / my previous minor comment #8. In the revised manuscript, in lines 97-98 it is stated that “*the WCB is the main cause for long-lasting precipitation (Catto, 2016). Furthermore, the WCB can be the cause of strong convection along the cold front*”. Then in line 102-103 it is written: “*the WJ is usually characterised by positive temperature anomalies, decreasing pressure with time and little or no precipitation.*” I cannot see how these two statements are consistent with each other especially considering in lines 93-94 it is stated that the WJ and the WCB are the same thing: “*..WJ is associated with a warm air flow, typically ahead of and later ascending above the surface cold front, often referred to as the warm conveyor belt (WCB)*” This part of the manuscript needs to be revised.
- Very minor comment: Appendix C is now referred to before Appendix A and B. Consider changing the order of the Appendices.
- Section 3.1 / my previous major comment #1c.1 (how the 12 storms were selected). I still find it a bit unclear. Is it the 12 storms with the largest SSI or is it storms with a non-zero SSI and then a subjective choice to make sure a diverse range of storms is chosen? Please clarify and add a few more details to the manuscript.
- Line 241 “the approach is independent of temporal evolutions beyond 1 h”. This is unclear - I think what is meant is that the approach is independent of temporal resolution greater than 1 h / time difference less than 1 h. Please revise.
- Line 243. “in several selected case studies” If this is the 12 case studies it would be clearer to write 12 rather than “several”
- Line 584. “Within the warm sector”. Should this read within the warm jet?
- Figure 6 and 7. Although CEP is defined in the text, it would help a reader to add this into the captions. Furthermore, the x-label “Forecast value” does not seem consistent with the revised terminology in the manuscript.
- Figure 8, 9 and 10. I really feel that the delta symbol problem will need to be fixed now or during the copy-editing stage. At worst, an explanation of this symbol needs to be added to the caption.