

We would like to thank again the two reviewers for their time and their constructive assessment of the manuscript. We concisely reply below to the additional suggestions of Reviewer 1.

Reviewer 1

I am happy with the revised manuscript. I just have a couple of small comments:

The paper is already pretty long. Section 2.3 Dynamical Diagnostic doesn't feel essential in the main text and could be moved to the supplementary. (e.g. extreme precipitation objects aren't used in the main text and are only mentioned once to point to the supplementary material) If readers want the details of how these tools are computed, they can look there.

Thank you for this recommendation. We agree with the reviewer's point and have moved to the Supplement the description of heavy precipitation objects. However, given that all other diagnostics were shown in at least one Figure of the main manuscript, and that cyclone tracking and QG-omega diagnostics are very important for the arguments made in Sect. 4, we have decided to keep the descriptions of the other diagnostics in the main text.

In Section 3.5, maybe rethink the word "Summary" as it could be confusing, or even adding something like summary of the dynamical features or similar might work better.

Thanks for the suggestion, to avoid confusion we changed the title of Subsection 3.5 to "Summary: Salient dynamical features of Storm Boris", and modified the title of Sec. 3 to "Meteorological analysis of Storm Boris".