

This paper was very well written and provides a clear and interesting assessment. I found as I read the manuscript that potential issues or shortcomings I had were eventually answered (i.e., comparison of the ERA5 variables to stations - which I am glad to see was done, and the comparison of wind/snow only events to SWGs, which was an interesting comparison I was going to suggest anyway). The authors acknowledge the shortcomings of ERA5 while showing why such a product is necessary for this type of assessment. I have made a few comments on some unclear sentences in the text which I suggest rewording for clarity, but otherwise I find this ready for publication. I have indicated I would be willing to review this paper, but I don't feel I will need to given the minor revisions I have suggested.

Reply: We sincerely thank the reviewer for the encouraging and thoughtful evaluation of our manuscript. We are pleased that the reviewer found the study clear, interesting, and suitable for publication, and that the analyses addressing potential limitations and methodological choices were considered valuable. We also appreciate the specific suggestions for improving the clarity of the text. All comments have been carefully addressed, and the manuscript has been revised accordingly.

Comments:

- Line 166-167: where the text says “Only those time steps are included in the comparison when snowfall is recorded on observation station” – I am not sure what this means. Is it that only concurrent hours between ERA5 and the station are included? Suggest a re-word here.

Reply lines 166-167 (lines in revised manuscript 181-183): the sentence was rephrased to: “The comparison was restricted to concurrent ERA5 and station observations during hours when snowfall was recorded at the observation station.”

- Line 196: where the text says “...the number of compound events varies largely spatially.”, it may be clearer to say something like “the number of compound events exhibits coherent spatial patterns.”

Reply line 194 (line in revised manuscript 222): This was changed accordingly.

- Line 327: where the text says “For short duration but extreme compound events were used the following fixed thresholds...” – I am unclear as to what this is meant to mean.

Reply lines 327 (lines in revised manuscript 327): It was meant to showcase the extreme events based on fixed thresholds instead of percentile thresholds. The "short duration" mixes the message. The sentence was changed to: " To complement the percentile-based approach, extreme compound events were also defined using fixed thresholds." In addition, the structure of Section 3.4 was slightly modified.