

Responses and Minor Revisions

I would like to thank the authors for their satisfactory responses to my first round of revision. By including the comments and suggestions of the two reviewers, they produced a clearer and more complete manuscript.

During my reading of the revised version of the manuscript, I noted some minor points to address, mainly on the figures, which, once amended, will enable the manuscript to be improved even further. They are listed below.

We thank the reviewer for the revisions suggested; we have cleared up some minor points relating to the figures and think that the clarity overall is improved. The changes are outlined below and can be found in the tracked changes version of the manuscript.

L132 - Modify reference to Table 1 by Table S1.

Done.

L392 - Modify reference to Fig. 3 by Fig. S3.

Done.

Fig. 3 - Add the information relative to "The scatterplots are coloured as heatmaps to display the concentration of data points, which is highest where the colour is red." in the caption.

This clarification has been moved to the caption of Fig. 3.

Fig. 8 - You have gray and black triangles. Is there a reason? If so, please explain; either plot all triangles in black.

The gray points indicate that there was no statistically significant correlation between the time series in that pair (at 95% confidence level). This distinction has been added to the legend for clarity, along with the shapes used for the individual pairs.

Fig. 9 (as well as Fig. S4) - For greater clarity, the colors used in the right-hand panel could be identical for each pair (E5S-J55 for example), with a difference in line style when the pair is of a different type (solid for offline-offline, dotted for reanalysis-reanalysis for example).

This convention has been adopted for Figs. 9 and S4 for clarity.

As suggested in the previous review, you might remind the reader that ERA5 and ERA5Snow have the same "meteorology", and that BrE5 is therefore used as the offline version with ERA5Snow.

We have added a reminder (L423-425) to assist interpretation of these comparisons.

Table S1 - Adding a column with parameter names, when possible, could help reading the table.

A column has been added to group parameter names by the process they correspond to. It was complicated to include parameter names, as not all parameters are easily interpretable, but this may still help readability.

Fig. S3 - x axis legend seems wrong. Do you mean "snow year" instead of "water year"? Please use the complete version of the caption presented in <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-201-AC2>.

Thank you for catching this detail. We group consecutive December, January, and February months for one DJF season (labelled by the year that December belongs to). This is a "snow year" grouping convention.

Fig. S5 - Please use the complete version of the caption presented in <https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-2024-201-AC2>.

The complete caption has been used.