

We would like to thank Dr Fernandes for his helpful comments and suggestions on the manuscript. We address his general and specific comments below:

General comments

In this manuscript the authors develop a spatially explicit FWI system climatology for the UK, expressed as percentiles, which is shown to have substantially higher skill than the approach currently in place. The ms. is clear and well written, and the findings are thoroughly discussed and well interpreted. The authors may consider two improvements: - The ms. is too long and I advise decreasing the extent of sections 2 and 6 (in this case there is unnecessary repetition of details previously presented); -A caveat of the approach that might be addressed in the Conclusion is that fire behaviour characteristics (hence fire suppression difficulty and fire effects) will vary by vegetation type and often will be unrelated with the percentiles. The primary objective of fire danger rating (and the philosophy under which the FWI was designed) is that a single value of a given index in a specific vegetation type should represent the same fire behaviour potential to allow more objective preparedness, pre-suppression and suppression planning to take place. See Alexander (1994) for more on this (<http://www.fire.uni-freiburg.de/fwf/Proposed-Revision-Fire-Danger-Classes-New-Zealand.pdf>)

***Response:** Sections 2 & 6 of the final manuscript will be revised to reduce the length of these sections, and an appropriate caveat highlighting the limitations of this approach with respect to potential fire behaviour will be added to the conclusion.*

Minor comments

Comment 1: P6999, line 20. Fire use for management purposes in the UK approaches more traditional practices than prescribed burning, i.e. the technical, planned and monitored use of fire. Advise elimination of “prescribed” from the sentence, here and elsewhere.

***Response 1:** The revised manuscript will make reference to ‘managed’ rather than ‘prescribed’ burning throughout.*

Comment 2: P7002, 11-2. Rephrase. Only fuels are flammable, not weather or topography.

***Response 2:** This will be corrected in the final manuscript.*

Comment 3: P7002, 128. Be more precise. Not all of the indicated studies have actually related FWI codes with observed fire behaviour so you are probably referring to fire activity. In Europe the only study to do so was the one by Palheiro et al. 2006 (A fire behaviour-based fire danger classification for maritime pine stands: comparison of two approaches. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 234(S1): S54)

***Response 3:** This section will be clarified, to better distinguish those studies that have looked to relate FWI components to fire behaviour/fuel state, and those that have investigated its relationship with historic fire activity. The reference provided will be included.*

Comment 4: P7004, 122. Viegas et al. 1999 related the FWI with fire activity, not with fuel moisture or fire behaviour. Again, check Palheiro et al. 2006.

Response 4: *This will be corrected in the final manuscript.*

Comment 5: P7006, 11-2. Yes, because fire behaviour in shrub fuels is weakly, if at all, affected by live fuel moisture (doi:10.1071/WF14130) and dead fuels large enough to respond to drought are mostly nonexistent.

Response 5: *This section will be modified to include these points and the relevant reference.*

Comment 6: P7022, 1 16-18. Perhaps fire sizes in the UK are not large enough to reveal such influences, but high values of the DMC, BUI and DC will increase landscape-level fuel connectivity, because under those circumstances vegetation types and topographic positions that normally act as fuel breaks will be dry enough to burn.

Response 6: *This suggestion will be included in the final manuscript.*

Comment 7: Figure 5. Wind speed clearly made the difference for this fire as shown by the ISI vs the FFMC.

Response 7: *This will be highlighted in the manuscript.*