

I would like to thank the authors for taking the time to respond to all my comments. This new version of the manuscript meets all the criteria for publication and is far better than the previous one. I really appreciate the consistency of your study, especially regarding the 'multi-scale analysis' mentioned in the previous version, and the effort you put into the Methods section. The level of detail in the analysis and the quality of the graphics make this a valuable contribution to the field, particularly given the lack of literature on the Chad region and the fact that these extreme events still cause significant damage.

I've noted your remark about the accessibility of in situ data. I also had concerns about it and I completely understand why you can't use it. Moreover, the commentary about satellite products is very convincing. Finally, I totally understand that you do not want to extend the scope of this study to the daily and sub-monthly environmental conditions. I really enjoyed your idea for a dedicated study of the 9-14 August period and I look forward to reading it.

As far as I am concerned, some technical corrections need to be made (you can find the list below), but no major or minor revisions have been identified.

I have just two remarks about your study.

- Firstly, you still describe the year 2003 as a “climatological transition threshold”. In my opinion, changing the climatological period (for example, by introducing a 5-year lag) would cause the long-term linear Sen's slope to intersect the baseline average in a different year (5 years earlier for the example). The formulation in the text is clearer and less open to misinterpretation than in the previous version of the manuscript. I just want you to be aware that the result depends on the climatological period.
- The section 3.4 (formerly section 3.2) is clearer, but its organisation does not align with the response provided to reviewers on pages 15–16. Please check your version of the manuscript.

Technical corrections :

- L204-208 : Thank you for taking my advice about the wind divergence into account. Unless you wish to retain it, this commentary is unnecessary. You can simply add the wind divergence to the sequence of meteorological variables (L204) that you extracted from ERA5.
- L282 : Be careful of redundant notation (T is defined here as both the return period and the temperature at L349).
- L318-320 : There is no need to define q, u and v again.
- L352: The gravitational acceleration g is already defined in L318, as is the specific humidity.
- L477-481 : You use TAMSAT as a reference for this Figure 4, as you mentioned it in the text. Could you also mention this in the figure caption?
- L503-508 : Can you indicate in the caption or in the Table that the Observed Value (August 2024) is an average on the study domain ?
- L585 : You forgot to suppress “3.2. Atmospheric drivers”
- L702 : “pink shading” instead of green
- Section 3.7 and Figure 9 : Contrary to your response to the reviewers, you forgot to mention the MSE and θ_e levels in both the text and the caption.
- L863 : “(Fig. 10)” instead of Fig. 8
- L879 and 884 : “Table2” instead of Table 1