

Dear Authors,

Thank you very much for your responses to my comments. According to your responses, you are planning to do the following:

1) *Substitute the comparison of annual rainfall statistics with 10-years rainfall statistics;*

This might lead to an improvement of your paper presentation and correct initial flaws, but you might want to consider a good number of statistics covering different rainfall properties other than cumulative rainfall amounts.

2) *Provide a discussion of subgrid variability and an expanded description and discussion of our assumption in this respect and the interpolation method that has been used.*

This might represent an improvement of your results since spatial variability would be accounted for in your analysis. However, it will be difficult to support reasonable conclusions about this issue, since you are relying on the analysis of a single location.

3) *Remove the analysis of rainfall extremes;*

Agreed

4) *Revise the wording in the paper according to the above changes, by in particular emphasizing the value and interest of comparing rainfall statistics computed over the whole observation period and common subperiods.*

Agreed

In view of the important number of changes in the conceptualization of the research and the need to add a good number of new analysis and results, I would reject the paper and encourage the authors to re-submit again after considerations of all suggestions and improvements.