We thank Prof. Mock for the comments made on our study. In the following response, the italics indicate Prof. Mock's comments and the remaining text indicates our response letter.

> *Overall, this is a very good paper that provides a unique approach in historical climatology on quantitative precipitation reconstruction for Paris in the Little Ice Age. Morin provided a unique record to conduct such a study. The authors provide nice descriptions of the data and methods (including the transfer functions), as well a potential drawback issues such as wind and evaporation on precipitation, comparisons with other types of data that include isotopes. The visuals mostly look quite good. I only have a few minor comments.*

> *1) Around Line 65, Section 2.1. Did Morin also have any seasonal aspect on his observations times due to changes in daytime, sunlight, etc.? Also, with daytime observation times, I assume potential lack of rain observations at night? (briefly touched on Line 140 but should be expanded). If there is any nocturnal aspect to precipitation generating controls, those would be missing in the reconstruction.*

Morin's measurements do not appear to show significant seasonal differences. These would, if so, affect the meteorological variables that he normally recorded three times at fixed times of the day. Precipitation, however, was recorded as many as six times a day on rare occasions. This also means that precipitation records cannot be determined precisely in terms of time. He also seems to have recorded at night, as can be seen for example in Fig.1, where the note extends over both days. This note may have been made at 2 am, after he got up. Moreover, Fig. 7 compares the number of wet days of the Morin data with those of the E-OBS data. Here, only slight monthly deviations are recognizable, which for us do not require a correction of the reconstruction. However, we see the need to make the point (possible underestimation of precipitation during the night / sleeping hours) more extensive and clearer than we have done so far. The reconstruction itself we will keep as before, only we will point out possible errors in the continuous text more extensively.

> *2) Figure 3 and around Line 190. I am pleased to see scatterplots for the calibration, but wonder with the Pearson's Correlation used, it utilizes the more non-parametric aspects of the precipitation data. Perhaps using Spearman's Correlation should also be included. The non-parametric aspects also apply elsewhere such as Figure 5.*

Thank you for this important point. We will add the Spearman Correlation coefficient to the figures.

> *3) Line 19. Precipitation and temperature are not the only important climatic elements, probably the most straightforward elements.*

Thank you for this comment. We will slightly correct the meaning of the sentence.

> *4) For some of the figures, all axis titles should be capitalized (first letter) for consistency, and the font size could be increased in some of the figures (ex. Figure 9) Figure 4 provides an ideal example.*

Thank you for this comment. We will correct the points raised.