

Dear Fredrik,
Dear authors,

I am sorry to say that this revision is not sufficient. I explained in detail what the problem is, and that the whole paragraph needs revision to correct the misunderstanding. It is not sufficient to just add one sentence at the end of the paragraph, and leave everything else. For example, your remaining sentences

1. "These values are lower than the app. 7% K-1 predicted by the Clausius-Clapeyron relationship (Trenberth et al., 2003)."

2. "Box et al. (2013) found the theoretically expected 7% K-1 ..."

are not in line with the theoretical foundations. @1 clarify that the 7%/K from CC refer to saturation water vapor pressure, not to precipitation. @2 For precipitation, it is NOT theoretically expected.

My suggestion is to only compare the precip. values in this paragraph. At the very end, I would explain in 1-2 sentences that your values are, as expected for most circumstances, smaller than the 7%/K from CC, which refers to water holding capacity, and not to precipitation.

I hope that my suggestion is constructive and that this is the last round of revisions, as the paper is reaching the maximum of appropriate revision cycles.

Thank you for your understanding,
Thomas Mölg

Handling Editor &
Co-Editor-In-Chief TC

Dear Thomas Mölg,

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to improve the manuscript. We apologize for not dealing with your comments in a satisfactory manner. We have made changes to the paragraph (now beginning on line 316) and also to the paragraph beginning on line 255. We hope they will be sufficient.

Best regards,

Fredrik