

Reviewer #1

The authors have carefully revised the manuscript and addressed the reviewer's comments. I appreciate that the hazard catalogue was updated with the latest version. The paper structure has significantly improved. Therefore, I only have minor comments:

We thank the reviewer for appreciating the revised version of the manuscript. We addressed all comments in the following.

L24: simplify sentence «...defined by..., defined by...»

We modified the sentence.

Figure 1: please provide coordinates, eg as a frame and a north arrow

We modified Figure 1 as suggested.

Figure 4: Is it possible that the 99th percentile of INCA in Fig 2 goes up to 70 mm/d but here the max is only at 35 mm/d? Or is it calculated over different areas? If so, please specify.

The 99th percentile in Figure 2 is calculated over all grid points and all days of the month in the 2003-2020 period, so high values like 70 mm/day can occur if intense rainfall was experienced locally. In Figure 4c, the local maxima are calculated on a daily basis and averaged annually, which smooths out single daily extremes, resulting in lower values (e.g., around 35 mm/day). Figure 2 is intended to focus on pointwise extremes, while Figure 4c is meant to assess the temporal variability of spatially and annually aggregated extreme metrics.

Conclusions: you already have an extensive discussion so I still think the conclusion can be more concise. Eg L731-736 should be clear to any reader who made it until here (even if only abstract was read). The other two paragraphs can be streamlined to the most important results related to the study aims (L97) and their implications for using these datasets and future studies

We streamlined the conclusions by removing redundant sentences and sharpening the final messages.

Reviewer #2

Dear Crespi and co-authors,

I want to thank you for your thoroughly crafted answers to the reviewer comments and in translating the suggestions into your manuscript. I would recommend to give the paper a final read-through and fine tune a few sentences and remove a few spelling errors.

Otherwise, you did a good job in improving the manuscript!

We thank the reviewer for appreciating the revised version of the manuscript. We checked the text carefully, corrected spelling mistakes and typos, and refined some sentences. As requested by the other reviewer, we further streamlined Conclusions by removing redundant sentences and sharpening final messages.