

Dear Carlo and co-authors,

Thank you for the submission of your interesting manuscript “Changes in extreme precipitation patterns over the greater Caribbean and teleconnection with large-scale sea surface temperature”.

As you know, two reviewers have now provided detailed reviews, which you have replied in thoughtful detail to. Both reviewers recommended major revisions and therefore I would like to invite you to submit a revised version of your manuscript.

Would you please also provide an ‘author’s reply’ to the reviewers (feel free to use the same words that you used in what you have already uploaded). Please can you also include a track changes document between the old manuscript and the new one (you can include this as part of your ‘author’s reply’).

In addition to the suggestions from the reviewers, I would like the authors to consider the following comments:

- (a) Can the authors provide a statement about the data and code availability?
- (b) Can the authors clarify in the revised manuscript why this specific precipitation dataset was used for this analysis and discuss the robustness of their findings?
- (c) All terms used in the abstract (such as SST) need to be clarified. The abstract should be fully understandable without the reader having to read the manuscript.
- (d) All figures should be readable and follow the journal’s standards (for e.g. width not less than 8cm, minimum resolution of 300 dpi, see <https://www.earth-system-dynamics.net/submission.html#figurestables> ).
- (e) Statements about correlation and their statistical significance should be carefully reviewed. If a result is not significant, you fail to reject the null hypothesis. Therefore, while one can say that a correlation is statistically significant, one cannot conclude that a lack of significance means no correlation.
- (f) Although your manuscript will undergo a copy editing at the final stage, there are sentences in your manuscript which one cannot follow due to the issues of English. I am not saying the English must be grammatically perfect, but to a level that it can clearly convey the scientific reasoning and findings.

I look forward to seeing the next version of your manuscript which I will then send out for further review to either the previous reviewers (if they agree) or new reviewers.

Best regards,

Dr. Anaïs Couasnon