Once again, we would like to thank you for your commitment to reading the manuscript carefully.

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection

(visible to the public if the article is accepted and published)

The authors did a good job in addressing previous feedback.

I still think that the paper and its message would benefit from a stronger red thread through the methods and result sections, which still seem a bit like a compilation of separate aspects. I would thus suggest that the authors take a moment to introduce the methodological flow based on Figure 1 (instead of only referring to that Figure) and clarify the reference to this flow and main purpose of that process step throughout the result sections.

Changes made accordingly.

Similarly, while the authors significantly improved the clarity about which data points are used to derive which results, the use of the specific event series (Dec 2020 - Jan 2021) still seems to disrupt the flow as additional and new information are introduced. It might be beneficial to introduce the event series as a sub-section in the section outlining the case study (along with the relevant figures or descriptive data), so that the authors can focus on the key results that were confirmed/derived from that case in the result section.

The manuscript has been amended in line with this suggestion.

Furthermore, there are some minor comments:

Lines 138-139: The meaning of K=8 is unclear. So far, the authors have only discussed K=0.8–0.9 - is this a typo?

This paragraph has been revised to clarify the meaning of the K parameter.

Figure 1: The figure appears incomplete, with some lines missing. Please ensure all elements are properly displayed.

The figure has been revised.

Figure 5: The x-axis extends beyond the key window of interest (Dec 2020 – Jan 2021). Adjusting it to this timeframe could improve readability and may even render Figure 7 redundant.

The reason for widening the time window of analysis was to better understand the temporal variation of daily precipitation and accumulated antecedent precipitation on days with heavy precipitation events and on days without heavy precipitation events. The two figures refer to data from different time intervals. Figure 5 refers to the precipitation of days and weeks and figure 7 to the variation in hourly precipitation.

Line 280 (new text added): The placement of this paragraph is unclear. It seems more appropriate in Section 4 (Relationships between sub-daily precipitation peaks and peak discharges), as it discusses a specific event (or series). Otherwise the motivation for the paragraph should be made more clear.

Corrected accordingly.

Positioning of Figures and Tables: The placement of figures and tables could be improved for better readability. Currently, references to figures are made before the reader has a chance to view them, sometimes introducing multiple figures in consecutive paragraphs without a clear order. Moving figures and tables closer to their first mention would enhance clarity and flow.

The positioning of figures and tables has been changed to ensure greater proximity between the reference in the text and the respective element.