

**Precipitation stable isotopic signatures of tropical cyclones in Metropolitan Manila, Philippines show significant negative isotopic excursions**

Dominik Jackisch, Bi Xuan Yeo, Adam D. Switzer, Shaoneng He, Danica Linda M. Cantarero, Fernando P. Siringan, and Nathalie F. Goodkin

**Reply to reviewer's comments:**

**General comment**

**I thank the authors for considering my comments. I think the manuscript has improved significantly compared to earlier versions. However, I still have some more specific comments that should be addressed before accepting the manuscript.**

**Response:** Dear reviewer, we thank you very much for your further comments, which clearly helped us to further improve the quality of our manuscript. We agree with your suggestions and have made corresponding changes, and in particular, shortened up the conclusion part.

**Specific comments**

**L refers to the lines in the revised manuscript with the highlighted changes.**

**- L208-209: Please move the sentence to Section 2.2.**

**Response:** We have moved the sentence to Section 2.2. Isotopic data (lines 151-152).

**- L210-212: Based on my experience, I would say that there is a high temporal variability in d-excess. Indeed, some samples seem to have a very evaporative signature (negative d-excess), whereas others have a d-excess even larger than 10.**

**Response:** We have therefore slightly altered the sentences to: "Although d-excess shows relatively high temporal variability, ranging from -15.18 ‰ to 24.31 ‰, it largely clusters in a small range between 5 ‰ to 15 ‰." (lines 209-211)

**- L232: I do not understand why the authors computed an average monthly rainfall. I think that the monthly rainfall amount (i.e., the sum) should be reported in Table 2, as well as in the following sentences (and in the data analysis).**

**Response:** We have changed it accordingly and now report the total monthly rainfall in Table 2 and in the analysis.

**- L239: Please report in the text what 'r' is. Does it indicate the Pearson correlation coefficient?**

**Response:** As suggested, "r" is now described at line 237 as the Pearson correlation coefficient.

**- L411-413: These results are not evident based only on Table 2. I suggest presenting a figure**

**similar to Figure 4, but using monthly data. Please consider using monthly rainfall amounts, and not an average.**

**Response:** The monthly values are presented in Table 2. However, the correlation between monthly values of  $\delta^{18}\text{O}$  and  $\delta^2\text{H}$ , d-excess, temperature, relative humidity and rainfall was already reported in the results section at lines 237-242. Therefore, we added a reference to the results section at line 432 with “(see section 3.1)”. Monthly rainfall is now reported as totals and not as an average.

**- L425-430: These lines belong to the Results. Please move them to the proper section.**

**Response:** We have moved these lines to the results section at lines 244-250.

**- Conclusions: This section seems too long, and I do think the main conclusions were presented already between L506 and L522. My advice is to remove the remaining text (or to shorten it), especially all the sentences presenting again in great detail the results and part of the discussion.**

**Response:** We shortened up the conclusion part. The initial part remains (lines 509-525) according to your suggestion, while the middle part is removed. We only kept the last few sentences as they sum up the manuscript.

**- Figure 4: I suggest showing the samples associated to TCs with a different color.**

**Response:** Thank you for highlighting this. Figure 4 now shows the samples associated to TCs (similar to Fig. 5) in red color.

#### **Technical corrections**

**- L103: It should be ‘The main objectives of this research are the following:’**

**Response:** Thank you, we changed it accordingly at line 103.

**- L202 and L253: It is unclear what the authors mean with ‘rainfall intensive’.**

**Response:** We changed it at line 203 and at line 261 to “heavy rainfall”.