

Reply letter

We thank the reviewer #1 and reviewer #2 for taking the time to read through the manuscript again and the reviewer #2 for the feedback on the Sect. 6.2. We acknowledge that general statements on the representation of the seeder-feeder effect in the ICON-model cannot be concluded from a single case study. Therefore, we already removed overgeneralizing sentences. We are willing to further reduce the respective paragraphs. Still, we think that the model comparison is quite important and worth to show. Therefore, we propose to leave out all scientific interpretation of the model comparison and move it to an earlier section. In the uploaded new version of the manuscript, we removed the Fig. 11b (along with its discussion) and we moved the Fig. 11a as the new Fig. 4 to the Sect. 4. We removed all scientific interpretation regarding the model comparison and only describe the figure and we briefly raise the potential precipitation underestimation/overestimation in the outlook to trigger for example a Master's thesis on this topic.

In addition, and off-topic, we changed the online-link of the Master's thesis of Gaudek, 2025 to the recently published paper (in ACPD) by Gaudek et al., 2025 as it is the same contents but a more reasonable citation (see line 328).