

Many thanks for replying to my comments in great detail and for carefully revising the manuscript. The manuscript including the readability has improved substantially.

Almost all of my comments have been addressed. My comments regarding the scientific matter have been answered thoroughly to my satisfaction.

In my view, there are only some minor and technical revisions needed, before the manuscript is ready for publication.

Minor point:

To me, it is not entirely clear, how the ensembles were handled. From the section about the differences between the SLP, I would infer that given values in the text are referring to the average difference calculated in between all pairs of ensemble members. However, from the method section I would guess that all the calculations are based on ensemble averages. Either way of calculation has consequences for the calculation of spatially heterogenous variables such as wind speed and precipitation. Please state exactly how you used the 5-member ensembles to calculate differences and the statistics shown in the manuscript.

Technical

- 1) There are still references missing. For instance, I could not find Sillmann et al 2012, Seneviratne et al 2013, and Donat et al 2011 in the reference list. My guess is that there are more such incidences in the references, which I likely have overlooked. Please carefully check all the references in the text.
- 2) p5 l3: typo in Yang et al.
- 3) p6 l34 to p7 l1: sentences need some editing. The last word „for“ does not make sense here. Assuming that the CO₂ concentration is a weighted average, change the sentences to: „... concentrations, aerosols, ozone, land use, and land cover for the 1.5°C scenario. For the 2°C senario, these conditions are the same, except for the CO₂ concentration, which is set to a weighted combination of the RCP2.6 and RCP4.5 scenarios.“
- 4) p7 l10 change to: „The simulated features of large-scale circulation are compared with reanalysis data of monthly pressure...“
- 5) p9 l21 change to: „...which is 0.98. As shown below, the differences...“
- 6) p11 first word change to „experiments“
- 7) p11 lines 21, 23, 26: you are referring to Figure 4b, instead you mean Figure 4a as the sentences are about the circulation and not the precipitation
- 8) p12 l 34: „at 5% significance“; the figure caption says 10% significance. Which one is right?

- 9) Figure 1a: There are no contours showing differences between ERA Interim and NCEP/NCAR
- 10) Figure 1: There is no picture showing NCEP/NCAR as the caption says. Or is NCEP only shown as the difference-contours in Figure 1a? If so, the caption would need revising. Further, the numbers next to the contours almost vanish, even though they are sized appropriately. The issue here is that there are too few numbers occurring at the contour levels. The few that are present can easily be missed in the areas where contours and coastlines are dominant.
- 11) Figure 6: The caption says 10% significance level for Figures 6a and 6b, the text however says 5%. (see point 8)
- 12) Figure 8 caption: typo in the words DJF 95th daily wind percentiles. Remove the „)“ between DJF and 95th.
- 13) Figure 9a) Please make the numbers next to the contour levels better readable.
- 14) Figure 9b) Make the caption consistent with the text. As you are analysing daily values, the number of occurrences are number of days (as it is written in the text). Also, I noticed that the numbers at the contour levels differ substantially from the numbers given in the plot of the previous version of the manuscript. Why are the differences in between versions so large? Have you discovered an error in your analysis? Normally, I would not ask, but such a difference makes me wonder, which version is correct.