Recommendation: Minor revisions

Summary: The paper outlines a 2-week block course designed to teach participants how to run the CM1 model and use state-of-the-art visualization tools to analyze the data. Detailed lesson plans are also provided, enabling instructors to easily adopt the material. The paper is well-written, and I only have a handful of minor suggestions.

General comments:

1. Can the authors provide a URL pointing directly to the course material? I landed on a German webpage that I found hard to navigate (I struggled a bit finding the course content).

2. Perhaps use "participant" rather than "student"?

Specific comments:

1. Line 2: CM1 is actually convection *resolving* (not only convection *permitting*).

2. Line 10: Suggest adding "e.g." before the reference.

3. Line 21: Use state-of-the-art instead of up-to-date? And again, consider "cloud resolving" instead of convection permitting.

4. Line 25: run → documented?

5. Lines 48, 49: Replace "chapter" with "section"

6. Line 55: Did the participants have to produce the 20 page report within the 2-week period?

7. Line 67: Here and elsewhere: Instead of single-computer, consider "single-processor" or "serial application"

8. Line 80: Is this level of detail needed (background of individual participants)?

9. Line 81: Suggest rewording: Not or only partially covered.

10. Line 94: How did the participant quantify the degree of lift in the field?

11. Line 104: Higher-resolution: Compared to what—perhaps report the grid spacing used in the different simulations?

12. Line 111, section header: Instead of "classic" perhaps use "intermediate"? The term "classic supercell" is usually part of the "high-precipitation", "classic", "low-precipitation" trio.

13. Line 125: Add a reference here?

14. Line 157: Replace "Fazit" with "feedback", and consider removing "and co-author to this paper"