

Thank you for your thoughtful responses to the reviewer comments and for the revisions made so far. I appreciate the importance of your topic and the potential contribution of this work and want to make sure that the methods are described with sufficient clarity in the final version. In particular, the manuscript refers to the study as a "survey" while also characterizing it as "qualitative." While qualitative surveys are possible, they are relatively uncommon and require careful explanation. Most of the results are presented in quantitative terms (e.g., percentages), which suggests a quantitative design. Importantly, using a non-random sample does not make a study qualitative—it remains a survey with a non-random sample. The manuscript needs a clearer and more accurate account of the research design, data collection, and analysis methods so that readers can properly evaluate the study.

Thank you very much for your kind comments.

Our study employs a quantitative approach, using a structured survey with closed-ended questions distributed to meteorologists worldwide. In the absence of a global census or sampling frame for this professional group, we adopted a non-probability, self-selected sampling method. Consequently, the sample is not statistically representative of the global meteorological community. However, the respondents' clear interest in the topic offers valuable insights and enables the identification of emerging patterns, perceptions, and trends among professionals actively engaged with the subject.

As requested by you and one of the reviewers, we have clarified this in lines 72–74.