We thank the reviewer once again for their constructive and helpful comments, which provided the last few corrections for our manuscript.

The authors have addressed my main concerns. The paper is now better structured with Section 3 presenting general results and Section 4 focusing on extremes. General knowledge about Mediterranean cyclones is now described in the introduction and definitions are clear and consistent. Also, Section 3.4 has been streamlined to better focus on the Mediterranean. Only I am still not convinced by the interest of discussing volcanic eruptions, at least not in the main paper. They are certainly important but Figure 5 shows their impact is almost non-existent in the Mediterranean.

As also suggested by the editor, we agree that the effect of volcanic eruptions on Mediterranean cyclonesis not significant enough to be represented in the paper and we have removed all references to volcanic eruptions in the methods, results and discussion.

l. 186 and elsewhere should be "10 mm (6 h)$^{-1}$"

We have included brackets in all units containing mm (6h)$^{-1}$ throughout the entire manuscript.

l. 191 very exact numbers are not needed

As these are just the total number of cyclones, and not a fractional number we donot really see the point of rounding them. Therefore, we have decided to leave the exact numbers in the manuscript.

l. 218 I still do not agree "the simulated storm track in the North Atlantic is too zonal". The above text says the opposite: "CESM overestimates cyclone frequency over the polar North Atlantic and underestimates cyclone frequency in the subtropical North Atlantic"

We eventually agree with the reviewer that the main pattern we observe related to the storm tracks is mainly driven by a northward shift of the storm tracks and to a lesser extent by a zonal bias in the model. We have rewritten the sentence in the following way:

"Thus, the biases generally indicate that the simulated storm tracks in the North Atlantic have a northward bias, and are to a lesser extent too zonal, especially in DJF." (l. 205-206)

l. 224 see previous comment

We have changed the sentence as follows:

"*This could be related to the storm track bias in CESM, and therefore, cyclones from the Atlantic penetrate the Mediterranean too little."* (l. 210-211)

Also in l. 213-214 we changed the following sentence:

“However, the slight overestimation in the eastern Mediterranean suggests that the zonal bias in CESM only plays a role in the central Mediterranean.”

to

“However, the slight overestimation in the eastern Mediterranean suggests that the storm track bias in CESM only plays a role in the central Mediterranean.”

l. 426 very locally

This part will be removed as it relates to the removed analysis of volcanic eruptions.

l. 431 see above

See comment to l. 426.

l. 447 I do not agree: there is almost no impact here either (for the Mediterranean)

See comment to l. 426.