

We thank the reviewer for reading our manuscript so carefully once more and for providing us further comments that are further improving the manuscript. We provide a response to their comment below. The Reviewer's comment appears in blue and our response in black.

Following the latest update, I only have one minor suggestion remaining. I appreciate that the authors have now implemented a more robust statistical testing. I still think that the authors' choices are well-justified for a dynamical analysis but suboptimal for the study of hazards, but since I have already made this comment once I believe it is now up to the editor to make a decision on this.

1) The authors cite some new studies to support their use of 850 hPa wind as a proxy for hazards. At least two of these citations are misleading. Manning et al. (2022) use surface wind gusts when available, and use winds at 850 hPa when gusts are not available. The same holds for Manning et al. (2023). Neither of the papers advocate using 850 hPa as a proxy of surface winds if the latter are available. In fact, Hart et al. (2017) is the only paper of the three cited which argues clearly for 850 hPa winds as a proxy for surface wind gusts. I recommend avoiding any phrasing that implies that the Manning et al. papers recommend using 850 hPa as a proxy of surface winds if the latter are available.

Thank you for pointing out these differences between the work of Hart et al. (2017) and that of Manning et al. (2022, 2023). We have modified the text to read "Rather than assessing the modelled surface effects, we assess the potential hazards that the target storm analogues represent even if they had followed a slightly different path. Consistent with this perspective and following Hart et al. (2017), WS850 is used as an estimator of maximum wind speed within the boundary layer, in turn used to estimate maximum surface wind gusts (Brasseur, 2001). Manning et al. (2022, 2023) make use of this approach when wind gust data are not available. Rather than lack of data, the use of WS850 in this work is motivated by the aim of assessing the potential of a storm to lead to impacts regardless of small differences in position: WS850 is a wind-related variable which is less affected by orographic effects than, for example, 10-m wind gusts."