Review of revised manuscript “Evaluation of convection-permitting extreme precipitation simulations for the south of France” by Luu et al. (2021)

I have now the comments of reviewer #3. This reviewer thinks you improved the manuscript but has another point you should take care of.

Response: We thank you and the anonymous reviewer for your enthusiasm in the evaluation process of our study. Please find below our point-to-point responses to comments of the reviewer.

"The authors have addressed the aforementioned issue for Sections 3.1 and 3.2, where daily rainfall and daily maximum 3 h rainfall are compared (Figures 2 and 3) with the SAFRAN and COMEPHRE gridded products. This change is recognized. However, in Section 3.3 (Figures 4 and 5), the authors still compare EUR-11 data (0.11°) with CPS data (0.0275°) that has not been upscaled to the EUR-11 grid. On top of this, the authors are here comparing the aforementioned gridded data against point observations. As explained in previous reviews, I don’t see the value of comparing precipitation intensities this way (e.g. 0.11° -vs- station data), particularly in the case of subdaily extreme precipitation. If the authors wish to persist with this, then they should also show the upscaled CPS-11 data in Figures 4 and 5, as they did in Figures 2 and 3, and make appropriate changes to the text in Section 3.3. That should be enough to finally get this paper over the line.

Response: We added the CPS-11 in our analyses of distribution of wet events (e.g., Figure 4 and 5). We also added a few changes to the text in Section 3.3 to discuss the added features from Figure 4 and 5.

Minor comments.

-L141: when discussing the impact of undersampling on the scaling curve, I suggest citing the study of Boessenkool et al. (2017) as a pointer to further information on the issue."

Response: We added the reference.