

Dear Editor,

As you suggested, we have included in the supplementary materials several of the analyses that supported our responses to the reviewers: the sensitivity of the analysis to the choice of the number of clusters (S1), to the influence of the wide range of climate sensitivities displayed by the CMIP6 models (S2) and also the sensitivity of the inter-model relationship between SLP changes and precipitation changes in winter to the outlier behavior of some models (Fig. S12).

We have added references to these supplementary materials in the manuscript (shown in bold).

line 130: “eight clusters are finally defined empirically (Fig. 1, **see section S1 for a sensitivity analysis to the number of clusters chosen**)”

line 289: “($r=-0.42$ with $p < 0.05$, **Fig. S12**~~not shown~~)”

line 420: “Selecting only models within the likely range of ECS would therefore lead to the exclusion of models with atypical hydrological behaviors over WCE (**see section S2**)”

Sincerely,
Julien Boé & Juliette Deman