

The authors have addressed most of the reviewers' comments, and the manuscript has improved accordingly. I do think the paper adds useful information to the extreme event attribution community, particularly given the need for multiple methodological approaches to improve comparability across studies. However, I consider that the concerns raised by reviewer 1 have only been partially addressed, particularly regarding the framing of the study.

In its current form, I think the manuscript does not yet clearly position its added value relative to the existing literature. Given the growing number of studies analysing this event using different methodologies, a key contribution of this paper should be a more explicit comparison with previous work, as well as a clearer articulation of the research question and the specific advantages and limitations of the approach used here. Rather than following a structure similar to earlier studies, the manuscript (in particular, the introduction and discussions sections) would benefit from being framed more explicitly as complementary to the existing literature.

I hope these comments are taken as constructive suggestions aimed at improving the clarity, visibility, and overall contribution of the manuscript.

#### **Introduction:**

As several studies have already addressed this event, the introduction should more clearly distinguish between what is already known about the influence of climate change and what remains uncertain. I suggest restructuring the introduction to summarise existing findings (including a brief explanation of the methods used in previous studies and the research questions addressed, which has not been done yet), and then clearly state the remaining gaps and how this study addresses them. Also, because a detailed description of the event is already provided later in the manuscript (results section), the introductory description of the event should be shortened; I would merge and shorten paragraphs 1 and 2 and remove paragraph 3. The emphasis should be on the novelty of the approach and the specific gap addressed, rather than on the event itself.

In addition, paragraphs 4 and 5 would require further adjustment rather than simply being moved earlier in the text. In particular, the discussion of the storyline approach in paragraph 5 appears redundant, as it is already introduced in paragraph 4 together with related methodologies.

So, to summarise, I suggest structuring the introduction as follows: very brief description of the event (one short paragraph). What do we already know about the influence of climate change on this event? (including a brief overview of previous studies and the methods used). What do we still not know, and how does this study address these gaps?

**Discussion and conclusions:**

This section would also benefit from clearer positioning relative to previous studies. I recommend starting with a more direct comparison with earlier work, highlighting what different approaches have shown and how the present study contributes to or differs from them. This would help clarify the added value of the study. The physical interpretation of the results can then follow this comparison. Hence, keeping a similar structure to the introduction, but with more direct comparison and discussion.

Furthermore, the manuscript would benefit from a more detailed discussion of the limitations of the approach used, as well as a clearer identification of remaining gaps that should be addressed in future attribution studies.

**Other minor comments:**

- Please justify the use of a 1950 baseline climate. This choice should be better explained, and its limitations discussed (e.g. why not use a pre-industrial baseline such as in DAMIP, which may provide a more appropriate reference for assessing climate change?). I guess this is because of the design of DestinE, but this should be acknowledged. In addition, line 166: 1950 does not represent a pre-industrial climate. Line 167: please clarify which forcing is being referred to (radiative forcing?).
- Lines 161–172: please clarify what is meant by “boundary conditions.”
- Lines 177–181: the description of the nudging procedure for the ensemble members needs clarification. In particular, please specify more clearly when nudging is switched off and reactivated, and over which exact period the model evolves freely.