

Thanks to the authors for the new addition of section 2.1, which clearly justifies the choice of this time period for analysis. Both this and the alterations to the text make the aims of the paper clearer. I also found the new cross-sectional diagrams in A3 and A4 very interesting, especially given the lack of 'textbook' cross-valley circulation at many locations.

I have a few small comments:

1. As I understand from line 111, the 17th December is now removed from all analysis, therefore the manuscript should refer to a 4-day period, rather than a 5-day period.
2. As model spin-up is a computational artifact, it is standard practice not to show it in results and therefore I'd recommend it's removed from all graphs in the manuscript (line 535). As the 17th December is not discussed in the analysis, I suggest it is removed from all graphs entirely for clarity.
3. Conclusions: As 17th December is not discussed in the results, discussion of this day should be removed from the conclusions (line 594: only north-westerlies have been discussed on the 18th December in the results).
4. Figures A3 and A4: these are very interesting, thank you for the addition! As the numbers are a little small, an addition in the figure caption of 'solid lines are positive values and dashed lines are negative values' would be helpful for clarity.
5. 91 typo: coincided -> coincide
6. 140: As using a spin-up period is standard practice in numerical modelling, this paragraph could be shortened to just state the spin-up period and reference Bonekamp 2018.
7. 211: Typo, repetition of 'WRF-simulation'
8. Figure 7: I would recommend adding that the wind velocity has been multiplied by -1 (e.g. m s⁻¹ (multiplied by -1)) to the y-axis label on the western slope, to make sure this important point is not missed.