

Report #1

This is my second review of the study. The paper has been improved through a clearer writing style, more thorough introduction of the data and methods used, corrected references to figures and tables, as well as improved figure/table captions. Most of my previous comments have been addressed adequately. Still I think my previous broader comment 5 should be addressed more thoroughly. I do not agree, that the minor comment of R1 justifies not addressing this topic in the introduction at all. Still the paper could be stronger if it directly referred to the other work in the context of weather regime surface weather linkages and weather regimes and climate change. This would emphasise the broader context of your work.

Overall the paper is now suitable for publication in NHESS.

We would like to thank the reviewer for the positive comments. Please see below, the point by point replies.

Comments:

Former Broader Comment 5. "Some more literature could be cited: E.g. studies by Lavers et al. 2016ab and Ferranti et al. 2018, also support the idea that large-scale fields provide more predictability for a local weather phenomenon than trying to predict the phenomenon itself. Linkage to climate change could be mentioned e.g. with Santos et al. 2016 or Schaller et al. 2018 in the outlook. Linkage of weather regimes to other surface variables e.g. wind could be mentioned (e.g. Grams et al. 2017)."

That was not in red in the previous version but most of the citations have been added as suggested. Please see p212. For climatological purpose, the link is not straightforward, and some differences exist that is why we prefer to not cite the references related to climate purposes.

Still I think there is room on p2 116ff to mention the robustness of the linkage of hot&dry extremes in climate models (Schaller et al. 2018). On p2 113 wind modulation by regimes could also briefly be mentioned. Alternately and in addition the Conclusions might be the place where to discuss potential impact of climate change.

Added as suggested

Actual Supplemental Figure captions still have numbers without the "S" (Fig. 1 instead of Fig. S1). I noticed, that you still refer to these using, the "S" convention, which really helps.

We have to see with the editor if adding this is possible according to the latex template of the journal.

Report #2

The authors have extensively addressed my initial concerns. The new format of Section 3 makes the description of the methodology easier to understand, and the more unclear sections of the study have been improved throughout.

We would like to thank the reviewer for the positive comments.

My only remaining concern before the manuscript may be publication-ready are a number of odd turns of phrase (e.g. “On extreme events” in the introduction, “provide now forecasts” in Section 6 etc.), which I would encourage the authors to address.

Modified as suggested

A further small detail: the colourbar labels of Figs. S5 and S10 are cut in the PDF.

Modified as suggested