

I thank the authors for taking all reviewer comments seriously and changing the text accordingly. The manuscript is in much better shape now. Track changes has left some missing spaces, double spaces, double periods etc. Check carefully again. I also find some grammar mistakes, I won't go through them here, please check carefully. I trust ESD to make some additional language check.

There are still some small things that I would like the authors to consider before publishing. There is no line numbering in the new version, I'll try my best to reference parts of the properly.

Mitchell formula:

Do "RCP2.6" and "RCP4.5" represent temperature here? Maybe it would be wise to denote them something like  $T_{RCP4.5}$  or  $T(RCP4.5)$  to avoid confusion with the emissions or radiative forcing usually associated to RCPs.

Maybe it's just me, but I don't understand how 2.05 is exactly 0.5 more than 1.5.

Figure 1: Maybe explain what a sponge zone is.

Figure 2: Still a bit blurry

Figure 3: Still a bit blurry

"this can lead to biases in heavy precipitation amounts.." Remove last dot.

Figure 4: Still a bit blurry

Figure 5: Still a bit blurry

"indicating that the distributions differ. The p-values for each of the PRUDENCE regions (Christensen and Christensen, 2007), shown in Fig. 1, are presented in Table 1. Bold numbers in Table 1 indicate that the distributions differ according to the test."

Could be changed to

"indicating that the distributions are significantly different. The p-values for each of the PRUDENCE regions (Christensen and Christensen, 2007, shown in Fig. 1) are presented in Table 1. Bold numbers in Table 1 indicate that the distributions are significantly different."

"one can see an increase in duration of the longest dry period" ->

"one can see an increase in the duration of the longest dry period"

"The ECHAM6 simulations suggest there is no difference" ->

"The ECHAM6 simulations suggest that there is no difference"

Figure 6: Still a bit blurry