

Dear Reviewer,

Thank you for your feedback on our manuscript. We appreciate the time and effort you invested in reviewing our work. We have considered your suggestions and have implemented the minor changes you recommended. Further details are set out in our point-by-point response (in blue), which can be found below.

Response to RC-1

Line 249: It is good that you italicized this approach.

Thank you, the reviewer's feedback is much appreciated.

Table 3: Thank you for the detailed explanation. From your comments, I understand that in the specific case of FRA, GSP is important, but not as important as other factors, such as CNI. GSP may appear significant in one dataset but not in another. CPM does not necessarily generate 100% precipitation-related results and can also be spatially distributed. Although I acknowledge this possibility, I would recommend that the authors suggest future work to test with more datasets.

Table 3, line 384-385:

After:

“Thus, for MON, the improved representation of the precipitation field at convection-permitting scale could be a relevant factor, since in other datasets at coarser resolution (i.e. E-OBS and RCM) precipitation-based indices are excluded by the MR.”

We added:

“To improve the understanding of this aspect and clarify the relative importance of the precipitation-based indices for the two study areas, the same methodology employed here could be applied to other climatic datasets derived from different convection-permitting models.”