

This was the second time I was involved as a reviewer for this manuscript. As I have mentioned before, the manuscript is well-written and I enjoyed reading it. My comments of the previous round of reviews have almost all been solved, only two minor points still have to be handled. I also want to emphasize that the authors satisfied me with their review in a very positive way. Additional model runs and new model versions were analysed for the reply, although some of them were beyond the scope of the study (as the authors state). This is a very constructive reply and the scientific community benefits from such efforts!

- Hannes Müller-Thomy

Comments from previous review:

RC2.7 Section 2.2 When introducing Zt the authors could state the intended application briefly and refer to Sec. 2.4 with the detailed description: It only affects p01 and p10, px remains unaffected.

AC2.7 Thank you for the suggestion. We will do so.

-> I could not find any modification in the manuscript to this point.

RC2.13 Fig. 5a) 'Standard deviation' – of what?

AC2.13 Thank you for noting that the description needs to be detailed. We will add "Standard deviation of precipitation".

-> 'Standard deviation of precipitation' is not concise and can represent various characteristics, I suggest 'Standard deviation of precipitation intensity'.