

We thank the reviewer for reading our manuscript carefully and for the comments. This document is a point-by-point reply to the comments.

Report 2

I acknowledge that the authors improved the manuscript much, following my suggestions, and I am thankful for that.

Unfortunately, there are still imprecisions, therefore the work cannot be published in the present form. I list a few of them, but authors are urged to carefully go through the text to spot more:

- Figure 2 caption does not correspond to the text description: the caption assigns Zonal Flow to summer and Atlantic Low to winter, the text says the opposite.

We corrected the caption.

- Figure 2 caption itself is not clear. Atlantic Zonal (NAO+) does not mean anything.

This is corrected.

- Figure 4: fonts are not homogeneous throughout panels.

We edited figure 4.

- Figure 5-6-A1 introduce the concept of Zonal Low, not described in the text. Is it the Atlantic Low?

This is corrected.

- Section 4: I would not use the acronym SWG in the section's title, authors should use Stochastic Weather Generator

That has been changed in the text.

- Conclusions: Lines 392-395 "We found that the NCEP and ERA5 extended reanalyses provide good performances for simulations, due to its longer length (≈ 70 years in NCEP and ERA5). Therefore the length of the analog database does make a difference, as already suggested by Jézéquel et al. (2018a)." This phrase makes no sense after performing the analysis with the extended ERA5 dataset.

We deleted this sentence.

Finally, many sentences are still convoluted and there are grammatical errors here and there. The authors are suggested to carefully revise the text with the help of a native English speaker.

We took care of English grammar errors (we also understand that the text will be copy-edited by Copernicus before publication) and we rephrased some sentences to make them more linear.