

## **Review of Do convection-permitting regional climate models have added value for hydroclimatic simulations? A test case over small and medium-sized catchments in Germany (Round 3)**

I thank the authors for this new phase of work and their attentive reading and consideration of the reviewers comment.

The paper has reached a mature form and is ready for publication.

However, I would like the authors to consider a couple of comments before the publication. These are minor details relative to their response to the last round of reviews.

1) I would like to return to my first comment, as I believe its importance in the context of your analysis may not have been fully appreciated. Your choice to focus on summer convective events is entirely pertinent for assessing the benefits of convection-permitting regional climate models. I fully understand that snow processes are not the main scope of your analysis, and it is indeed relevant to explain these methodological choices in the methodology section.

However, to ensure clarity for the reader, I suggest adding a sentence somewhere at the end of the introduction to explicitly state that the analysis focuses on hydro-climatic summer convective events. This would help to define the scope of the study from the outset.

2) I thank the authors for having greatly improved the frequency analysis with the comparison for higher quantiles. Just to clarify one point : Are the values of 11.7mm for ICON3km and 7.3 mm for RADOLAN 3km stand for the 99.95th percentile (in your response) or for the 99.9 th percentile (in the manuscript). Please check and update the percentile value if necessary in the manuscript.

The same comment can be done for the 11.7mm value (in your response) and 11.6 mm (in the manuscript).