

Response to Reviewer 1

We thank Reviewer 1 for the careful reading of the manuscript and the constructive comments, which have helped improve clarity, consistency, and presentation. All comments have been addressed as outlined below.

Line 116:

Comment: “likewise specified by ERA5 .’ here is a space too much.”

Response: The extra space has been removed.

Line 120:

Comment: “Maybe instead of ‘anomaly runs’ write ‘pseudo-global warming runs’ and make a reference to the next section?”

Response: The terminology has been revised to “pseudo-global warming runs,” and a reference to the subsequent section has been added for clarity.

Line 158:

Comment: “In (see Zeitzen et al. (2025)) you may remove the () around 2025. Also, in Line 172 and Line 219, and Line 352. Please consistently apply citation style throughout the study.”

Response: The citation formatting has been corrected, and citation style has been made consistent throughout the manuscript at all indicated locations.

Line 187:

Comment: “Perhaps; ‘a zone of strong temperature gradient’.”

Response: The phrasing has been revised accordingly.

Line 222ff:

Comment: “Remove the space between ° and C in the unit.”

Response: The unit formatting has been corrected.

Response to Reviewer 2

We thank Reviewer 2 for the insightful and constructive comments, which have contributed to improving the clarity and structure of the manuscript. All comments have been fully addressed as follows.

Line 104:

Comment: “This feels somewhat repetitive introducing HARMONIE again; the first part of this sentence could be removed or merged with the previous paragraph.”

Response: The sentence has been revised and merged to avoid repetition and improve textual flow.

Section 2.3:

Comment: “Is this using the 15-minute wind data mentioned before, or hourly? Please specify in this section.”

Response: The section has been revised to explicitly state that the CWEI is applied to hourly mean wind speed data, while noting its applicability to higher-temporal-resolution datasets.

Lines 242/243:

Comment: “Could the authors acknowledge the difference between the PI and control simulations here?”

Response: The main text now explicitly acknowledges the higher areal fraction in the PI simulation relative to the control simulation, with further discussion retained in the Discussion section.

Figure 6b:

Comment: “Please state the damage threshold being used in the figure caption.”

Response: The figure caption has been updated to explicitly state the applied damage threshold.