Dear Pascal

Thank you for again providing feedback. Please find below a point-by-point response.

Best regards

Frank

Non-public comments to the author:

Dear Frank, Ross, and Veronica:

Thank you very much for the submission of your revised manuscript and for taking the time to address all of the reviewers' comments. I believe that the clarity and focus of the manuscript has improved substantially.

Please see below for some technical comments about the writing style and potential typos. I hope these comments are useful and help you finalize the manuscript. I am also highlighting some of the NHESS style guidelines you might want to consider before submitting the final production files. Taking care of these issues ahead of time will make for a smoother process.

We now place the footnotes with the German original in brackets within the text. In addition, we now only provide translations for cases, which are not listed in the tables in the Appendix.

We removed the vertical lines in most of the tables.

Table 5: following correspondence with the editorial team when submitting the revised version of the manuscript, we refer to this table as table rather than figure. However, we provide the table as a PDF figure. While we consider that keeping the colored cells is important to facilitate the understanding of the table (similar to a heat map), we don't mind referring to this as either a table or a figure.

In addition to these minor points, I would like to ask you to carefully consider whether all tables and figures are necessary for conveying the key take home messages of your study. The number of tables and figures seems quite large, and the content does not always seem critical and sometimes a bit redundant to what is mentioned in the text. A good example is Figure 4, which shows the kappa values between all the different forecasters. Since the agreement is substantial among all forecasters—which is the main take home message—a simple sentence stating that seems sufficient.

We moved this table to the Appendix.

Another example is the descriptions of Table 5 and Figure 6, where many of the statistics shown in the table and figure are explicitly mentioned in the text again. In addition to this redundancy, the frequent citing of figures and tables in the text makes the text choppy and unnecessarily difficult to follow.

We strongly reduced the citing of figures and tables in the Result and Discussion section. We now only refer to the respective subfigures and table once in the respective Result sections 5.1 and 5.2.

I therefore believe that a critical review of the tables, figures, and their citation in the text could improve the clarity and focus of the manuscript. However, this is more of a suggestion, and I do not have a strong opinion about this.

Minor questions

Line 46 & 51: You are using the term "symbol" here, but it is not completely clear what you mean with this. Might this be a leftover from when you explained the semiotic triangle at the beginning of the introduction? I see that you explain the term on Line 302 as words or icons. Maybe just use those terms in the introduction to make the points easier to understand with less jargon.

We have changed these mentions to icons.

Line 80-84: This description of the methods might not be necessary in the introduction.

This was originally suggested by a reviewer, and we think it is helpful and would prefer to leave as is.

Line 109: It might be easier to just say 5pm (or 17:00) local time. The time zone does not seem to matter in this context, and it gets you around the footnote.

We have changed as requested.

Line 222: I am not sure I understand what that sentence means.

We have slightly reworded this sentence to make it clearer.

Table 5: I do not think you can include shading in a table unless you turn it into a figure.

Refer to reply by editorial team - Fig or Table.

Table 5: I found the use of the asterisk rather confusing, and the explanation did not help me to understand what is going on. Do you really need it, or couldn't the counting of the factors be described in the text more easily?

We don't think that the counting of the factors could be well described in detail in the text. Table 5 provides additional information. However, we changed the order of the columns 2 to 5, which allowed us to remove the asterisk.

Line 205-208: Can you add a sentence explaining why this was useful/necessary.

We added a clause to make this clearer :"... so as to retain the ambiguity expressed by forecasters in the analysis."

Discussion: It seems to me that in the discussion section, you describe the proportions of term use in percentages while you express some of the same information as decimal fractions in the result section. See, for example, Line 355-357. Please check for consistency.

We changed proportions to percentages throughout the manuscript (text, Figure 6, Table 5).

Supplement: I am not sure what the purpose is of the supplementary material since it is not cited in your manuscript at all. Please delete if it is not critical for your manuscript.

The supplement was intended to support Table 1, but the reference to the supplement was missing. We now refer to the supplement in the Table caption.

Typos and minor errors

Line 37 (and other spots): "key words" should be one word.

Done.

• Line 38: delete "e.g., in Norway:" The sentence already mentions Norway.

Done

• Line 51: Revise to "Engeset et al. (2018) tested the comprehension of text, symbols and picture among Norwegian avalanche bulletin users and noted …".

Done

• Line 151: I don't think you need the "c.f." in this reference. In fact, I don't think this is needed in any of the references you included it.

"c.f." is removed throughout the manuscript.

- Line 155: Simplify to "… is provided in Appendix A1."

Done

- Line 203: Change "Tab.s" to "Tables".

Done

- Line 214: I would write "We conducted this part of the analysis in two steps: …" to better highlight that this particular description does not relate to the entire analysis.

Done

- Table 5: The proportion for 1 of 3* and 2-Mod is missing a decimal digit. It should be 0.30 for consistency.

Done

- Line 297: Simplify sentence to "To discuss our results, we introduce the semiotic triangle … "

Done

- Line 313: I think this should be "use" instead of "used" since this statement relates to producing avalanche forecasts in general and not just your study.

Done

- Line 324: I think this should be "hedge" and not "hedged".

Done

- Line 332: Change start of sentence to "The answer to this question provides …" because "it" could refer to other terms in the previous sentence.

Done

- Line 343: The "the" is not necessary and can be deleted in "… made by the forecasters …"

Done

- Line 407/8: You can simplify the sentence to "… is therefore likely higher …"

Done

•   Line 435: It is unusual to start a paragraph with "however" as it is a linking phrase that ties the statement to the previous sentence.

We have added this to the previous paragraph, as we would prefer to keep the however to clearly signal a limitation.