**We would like to thank both reviewers for taking the time to offer many constructive and helpful suggestions that have assisted in improving the quality of the manuscript. We have revised our manuscript based on the comments and corresponding responses, and have justified the reasons where proposed revisions are not made. We believe that the resulting manuscript is consequently much improved over the initial submission. Responses to individual comments and main corresponding changes made in the manuscript can be found below.**

**Reviewer #2:**

This is a nice written manuscript. To understand the changes of extreme precipitation is very important for both the water resources and flood management. This study used a variable-resolution CESM at spatial resolution ~30 km to study the extreme precipitation. Overall, the model performance is convincing.  However, my major concern is lack of discussions on the mechanism modulating the changes in extreme precipitation. I ask a revision between minor and major which can mainly address the following comments:

Major comments:

1. Since this study only used one model and a few members (2 for present and 4 for future scenarios), the central question is how robust the predicted results compared to CMIP5 models or CESM large ensemble runs?

This is a good point. There are quite a few papers focusing on the precipitation changes within CMIP5 models globally. For examples, Kharin et al. (2013) found amplified changes (2-3 times) in extreme precipitation compared to mean precipitation in CMIP5. Specifically, from their study, P20 (globally averaged 20-year return values of annual daily precipitation extremes) increases more than 20 % in the RCP8.5 experiment by the end of the 21-st century. They also stated that the majority of the models simulated values in the 4–10 %/°C range and 1.5–2.5 %/°C range, for P20 and annual mean precipitation respectively in the CMIP5 ensemble. This further supports that extreme precipitation follows changes in temperature more closely to the Clausius-Clapeyron relationship than precipitation mean. They also argued that simulated late 20th-century precipitation extremes are plausible in the extratropics, although uncertainty remains very large for extreme precipitation in the tropics and subtropics.

Sillmann et al. (2013) also found that the contribution of very wet days to the annual total wet-day precipitation has generally increased by the end of 21st century (period 2081-2100), compared to the reference period 1981-2000 based on CMIP3 and CMIP5 output. Generally, in their study, the projected changes for the 2046–2065 period intensify toward the end of the century, with overall model agreement on the increases of total wet-day precipitation, very wet days and the heavy precipitation days index (R10mm). Those findings cover the western U.S.

What we found in this manuscript is generally consistent with the aforementioned findings for similar time periods, although our manuscript provides significantly more regional detail. However, the disagreement exists mainly over the California, where CMIP5 shows no significant changes in mean precipitation as what we found in VR-CESMs but significant changes for P20, which are not shown in our results. This is probably due to the large inconsistency in how different CMIP5 models project changes of ENSO, which is one of the main regulators for the precipitation extremes over California as illustrated in details in the manuscript.

In Pendergrass et al. (2015), it is argued that in contrast to mean precipitation, extreme precipitation depends on the warming magnitude rather than emissions scenario in most CMIP5 models. This provides further support for the reduced uncertainty of our results due to the prescribed SST and sea ice and fixed changes of GHGs, making no need to resort to large ensemble runs. In their study, the recently developed and publically-available CESM large ensemble runs (CESM-LENS) are also used. It is found that the spread of global-mean precipitation changes within CESM-LENS (with only internal variability) is much smaller (about one order) than the spread across the CMIP5 multi-model due to the extra structural variability. This conclusion also loosely applies to the extreme precipitation.

Pendergrass et al. (2015) also found that the slowly changing trend of the global-mean precipitation per degree in RCP8.5 than RCP4.5 in the CESM-LENS is consistent with the CMIP5 ensemble mean. As they argued, in CMIP5, the intermodal spread is smaller for mean or extreme precipitation over extratropical land (covering our study area) than for all land, i.e. models agree better on the response of extreme precipitation in the extratropics with relatively well represented precipitation-driven dynamics in GCMs.

For further reference, the changes of mean precipitation, near-surface temperature and wind pattern between period 2056-2080 and historical 1981-2005 can be found at this [website](http://www.cesm.ucar.edu/experiments/cesm1.1/LE/) provided by NCAR for at least five ensemble runs of CESM-LENS output. Even though the spatial features are not resolved, within our expectation, the overall sign of the changes in CESM-LENS over western U.S. are consistent to what we got.

In Figure S5 (originally the supplemental Figure S3), the results for precipitation features simulated by CESM at ~1 degree are given. It can be seen that, due to the complex topography over the western U.S., the spatial pattern and magnitude of precipitation are poorly presented and generally underestimated in CESM at coarse resolution. It is hard to be confident that precipitation changes can be well-captured without the incorporation of fine-scale dynamical processes. The ability for GCMs to simulate extreme precipitation also strongly depends on the horizontal resolution as discussed in Wehner et al. (2010) since precipitation typically intensifies at high resolution (Rauscher et al. 2016; O’Brien et al. 2016). In addition, given that the CMIP5 and CESM-LENS predictions over the 21st century are coupled ocean-atmospheric simulation, it is even more difficult to compare directly to our results, which are purely forced by the bias-corrected SSTs from mean coupled CESM output.

Accounting for models’ uncertainty is surely important, however, we also want to motivate the use of a high-quality model to reduce the signal noise. Means from multiple models are better for simulating the climate variability, but the accuracy might be reduced due to compensation of the results from both good models and fair models. Our aim in this study is to understand how precipitation is supposed to be changed in diverse climate regions in the future, and what are the main mechanisms that drive corresponding changes in a well-performed model with well-represented topography. Even using different models, we suppose the physical relationship and spatial characteristics still hold.

In the manuscript, the following sentences were added to the Introduction part from line 45 to line 50.

“For example, in the context of globally-averaged projections, Kharin et al. (2013) found that changes in extreme precipitation were amplified (by 2-3 times) compared to mean precipitation in the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) models. Generally, models show better agreement on the response of extreme precipitation in the extratropics, where large-scale precipitation is more prevalent, than in the tropics and subtropics (Kharin et al. 2013; Pendergrass et al. 2015).”

From line 308 to 310, we added: “The ability for GCMs to simulate extreme precipitation also strongly depends on the horizontal resolution as discussed in Wehner et al. (2010) since precipitation typically intensifies at high resolution (Rauscher et al. 2016; O’Brien et al. 2016).”

References:
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2. What is the inter-member spread of the results by comparing the four members in future simulations? Are they showing consistent trends of precipitation changes?

Thanks for pointing out this. The inter-member variability has been illustrated using the differences between each member and the ensemble mean over each time period (see the supplemental figures S1, S2 and S3 for the three time periods’ internal variability, respectively). It is clear that the variability within the members’ yearly-averaged output is quite small comparing to the changing signal among the different time periods. As further supported by the relevant statistical tests (here, we used the student t-test), different members of the same ensemble are not significantly different, showing a converge results in our conclusions.

In the supplement, the figures S1-S3 have been added. The following sentences were added to the main content from line 178 to line 183.

“…(see supplement Figure S1-S3 for the inter-member variability). Although a multi-model mean is often preferable for capturing climate variability, we also note that accuracy may be impacted by compensating results from models of differing quality. Further, since our study focuses primarily on understanding the drivers of changing extreme weather, the changes that emerge from a single model are indicative of the physical relationships that will hold in the coming century.”

3. Any mechanism or discussion related to the changes of extreme precipitation in addition to the modulation from ENSO?

ENSO is definitely one of the main regulators for the changes of extreme precipitation. In addition, the changes of extreme precipitation over western U.S. in this study are mainly due to the increased large-scale water vapor influx from the eastern Pacific Ocean compound with the orographic forcing effects. In the future, as the climate warms, intensified water vapor influxes are expected to cause larger heavy-rainy events. The modulation of ENSO is directly related to the inter-annual variability of precipitation extremes. More details can be found in Section 5 of the manuscript.

Minor comments:

The figure quality can be improved.

i.e., Figure 2: The visibility can be improved if the labels of the longitude (right 3 figures) can be removed.

I am sorry; do you mean the latitude instead?

**Reviewer #3:**

The manuscript describes results from a variable resolution CESM with spectral element dynamic core with an overall resolution of ~110km and a grid refinement of ~25km over the western USA. The buffer zone between the two nests is approximately along the central US and well north and south of the Western USA. This variable resolution model has been shown to perform reasonable well without introducing any significant effects on the global scale circulation by Zarzycki et al., 2015, where they used a refinement over the North Atlantic. However, it was noted that model introduced excess precipitation within the refined domain. This paper discusses a refinement of the grid over the western USA.

Although Zarzycki et al., 2015 did observe increased precipitation over the 1 degree uniform-resolution simulation, this was in part because of an underestimation of extreme precipitation on the coarse grid. Our own analysis suggests that VR-CESM actually performs quite well in almost all precipitation regimes. To verify this is consistent with Zarzycki et al., 2015, we contacted the lead author for clarification. He pointed out that in their study, the precipitation increase of 3%

The manuscript reads like a technical report submitted to a funding agency rather than a paper meant for a journal. A series of contour plots are presented with results from VR CESM and a number of observational data sets. I am not sure how to read this paper as a Journal of climate publication. It does not describe a detailed evaluation of the model performance, a new parameterization or model sensitivity. It reads like a summary of results from a series of simulations. It would be very helpful if there is additional analysis presented that makes a compelling case for the reader to spend time going through the paper either due to a unique aspect (extremes of precipitation? Or since you are using NARR dataset may be the diurnal variability of precipitation) when compared to a non variable grid CESM at 110 km resolution. Overall, it may be useful to present some comparison for this region between the CESM and vr CESM for precipitation, precipitable water,monsoons, atmospheric rivers or column water vapor over this region for seasonal and for monsoon season. This seems like a great new model, what is unique about it and how well does this model compare for may be specific cases (like monsoons ) when compared to very high resolution non hydrostatic models like WRF or REGCM that also aim to derive this type of information?

We disagree with the reviewer with regards to the appropriateness of the publication for J.Clim. The further study of atmospheric rivers and the North American Monsoon System are topics that could individually occupy their own publications, and necessarily rely on the study of precipitation extremes presented in this work. We expect that these topics will be broached in a future publication, as substantial work remains on detection and characterization of these features. Several of our past publications have delved into model validation in detail compared to both observations and a high-resolution non-hydrostatic model WRF, and so we are now interested in using the model for projecting and understanding the extreme precipitation climatology of the Western U.S. through the end of the century. That said, additional comparison between the precipitation climatologies of CESM and VR-CESM has been added in the response to the comment question (d).

As we stated in the introduction, although past studies have addressed some questions related to how extreme precipitation is changing, we believe that our regional focus and the employment of this cutting-edge high-resolution tool now gives us greater confidence in these projections, as well as their mechanisms. The importance of regional downscaling for precipitation studies has been emphasized by many previous global studies as discussed in the introduction. In order to better understand precipitation features and to implement climate mitigation and adaptation strategies realistically, much more efforts need to be made along with more attention to shift from global rough results to regional details. In particular, our work predicts enhanced IVT through the end of the century as a major driver of enhanced extremes and points out the importance of ENSO in determining the future character of those extremes. This work is important for a comprehensive understanding of the future precipitation changes, particularly in the context of atmospheric rivers and with regard to changes in circulation patterns over different regions.

a) The reference figures were generated assuming equal confidence in the datasets from UW gridded dataset, CPC and NARR. This is most likely incorrect, as NARR has been shown consistently underperforms observations (CPC) over the western part of the country (Bukovsky and Karoly, 2007; Bukovsky, M. S., and D. J. Karoly, 2007: A brief evaluation of precipitation from the North American regional reanalysis. J. Hydrometeor, 8, 837–846.).

Thanks for pointing this out. As others have observed, NARR is certainly not as good at representing precipitation climatology as the gridded observations of CPC or UW. We agree that these datasets should not be treated as equal confidence (even if they are treated that way by the stakeholder community). However, our purpose is to combine the gridded observations and reanalysis dataset together to account for the uncertainty in different sources of references. Our comparison is primarily to understand if the climate of VR-CESM could be reasonably determined to be representative of the uncertainty that is present in other frequently used datasets.

In another paper of ours (Huang et al. 2016), we did examine the differences among various references including Daymet, PRISM, UW, CPC, and NARR over California. Overall, UW outperforms CPC, and CPC is better than NARR but not by much.

In the manuscript, we added the following sentences from line 251 to 255.

“It is widely acknowledged that NARR is not as good at representing precipitation climatology as the gridded observations of CPC or UW (Bukovsky and Karoly 2007; Huang et al. 2016). However, the differences between NARR and gridded products also tend to be greatest in regions of high observational uncertainty, and so its inclusion is useful for quantifying the performance of VR-CESM against this uncertainty.”

Reference:

Huang, X., A. M. Rhoades, P. A. Ullrich, and C. M. Zarzycki, 2016: An evaluation of the variable resolution-CESM for modeling California’s climate. Journal of Advances in Modeling Earth Systems, doi:10.1002/2015MS000559.

b) Was the observational data regridded to the model output for each of the datasets used or the model data interpolated onto the observational data grids?

We applied the interpolation to the simulation grid to keep the simulation dataset at its original output resolution.

We added the sentence from line 228 to 229: “For comparison purposes, the reference dataset is interpolated to the model grid as needed, using bilinear interpolation methods.”

c) The performance of VR CESM has been compared to similar resolution WRF simulations and said to compare favorably with only a modest improvement in performance at higher spatial resolutions. Wang and Kotamarthi (2015; Wang, J and Kotamarthi, V. R.: High resolution dynamically downscaled projections of precipitation in the mid and late 21st century over North America, Earth's Future, 3: 268–288. doi:10.1002/2015EF000304, 2015) performed a comparable set of simulations at 12km resolution with WRF and it shows significant improvement over the host CESM simulations for this region.

Thanks for pointing out this. We need to clarify that in the manuscript, it is stated that VR-CESM demonstrated comparable performance to WRF at 27 km with similar downscaling resolution (about 28km) showing significant improvement contrasted to CESM at ~1° resolution. This is consistent with the findings by Wang and Kotamarthi (2015) who stated that WRF simulations at 12 km significant improved the host CESM at near 1° resolution. We also pointed out VR-CESM at higher-resolution (about 14 km) did not appear to substantially improve model accuracy compared to the one at 28 km constrained by the lack of scale-aware model parameterization schemes. Recent work by Rhoades (personal communication) has shown that this is due to the diagnostic treatment of precipitation by MG1 microphysics (the default in CAM5). Tests with an early version of CAM6, which use prognostic MG2 microphysics routines, show dramatically improved mountain precipitation climatology.

In the manuscript, the following sentences were added.

“Recent work by Rhoades (personal communication) has shown that using prognostic MG2 microphysics routines can dramatically improve mountain precipitation climatology, as tested with an early version of CAM6. The bias might also be related to more complex dynamic processes or the lack of the scale-aware mode parameterization schemes when producing the orographic forced precipitation.”

Reference:

Wang, J and Kotamarthi, V. R.: High resolution dynamically downscaled projections of precipitation in the mid and late 21st century over North America, Earth's Future, 3: 268–288. doi:10.1002/2015EF000304, 2015

d) It will be very useful for the reader to have a comparison of the CESM and VR CESM over this region for evaluating the model performance. I am not entirely sure if the overall precipitation in the refined grid domain has increased, decreased or stayed the same when compared to the CESM.

We agree. Actually, this work has already been investigated with the relevant plot included in the supplement (originally Figure S3, now Figure S5). For a more clear explanation, we have updated the figure S5 putting the results of VR-CESM, CESM together with the observations. As mentioned in the response to the first question by the other reviewer, the results further support that the ability for GCMs to represent precipitation strongly depends on the horizontal resolution with precipitation intensification expected at high resolutions.

Overall, precipitation patterns over complex topography are poorly represented in the ~1° dataset without capturing the spatial patterns induced by orographic effects. Over the Cascades and the Sierra Nevada, where majority precipitation locates, total precipitation is grossly underestimated by the coarse resolution data, as compared to gridded observations, so does precipitation extremes. Precipitation has otherwise been smoothed out over the coastal areas and the mountainous regions of the northwest U.S at coarse resolution. It is also found that CESM without nested refined domain tends to underestimate the low-rainy days at the windward side but overestimate the ones over the lee side especially for the Cascade ranges (also refers to Figure S5). This bias is reduced with finer resolution though not fully resolved. This result clearly underscores the benefits of high resolution (particularly the representation of topography) in simulating precipitation features.

In the manuscript, the original Figure S3 is replaced with Figure S5, with the previous sentence updated to “In order to better understand the impacts of resolution, the precipitation climatology of CESM at  ~1◦ resolution is also assessed in the supplement (see Figure S5).” at lines 300-301.

e) The abstract indicates that the manuscript is attempting to evaluating the spatial patterns of precipitation produced by VR CESM with observations. It would have been much more helpful to present spatial correlations between the observational data sets and model results to emphasize this aspect of the work. It is really difficult to evaluate this based on a series of contour plots that are presented as difference over each pixel.

We thank the reviewer for the suggestion. The spatial correlations have been added in the text to further support the arguments with values ranging from 0.7 to 0.9. The large values of the spatial correlation were not included in the first draft since, although they are an effective metric for evaluating model performance, they do not provide much insight into the reasons why model biases may occur. To better understand the source of model bias, we believe it is better to understand local biases within regions, which have the diverse principal drivers of extreme precipitation (such as upslope regions, rain shadows, regions susceptible to atmospheric rivers, and regions with convectively driven precipitation).

From line 222 to 224, we added: “Spatial correlation is assessed by computing the Pearson product-moment coefficient of linear correlation between climatological means from models and reference datasets.”

Following the sentence “Overall, VR-CESM accurately captures the spatial patterns of precipitation” at line 256, we added, “(with spatial correlation coefficients larger than 0.9 as compared to the observations)”.

From line 265 to 266, we added: “The spatial correlations are about 0.85, 0.75, 0.8 and 0.9 for R1mm, R5mm, R10mm and R20mm compared to the references.”

From line 267 to 270, the original sentence is updated to “Nonetheless, over most regions, the relative contribution of each precipitation frequency subset to total precipitation (including F1mm, F5mm, F10mm and F40mm) is fairly well represented by the model (with spatial correlations ranging from 0.7 to 0.8), suggesting that the model is effective at capturing the overall frequency distribution of the precipitation intensity.”

Following the phrase “Second, the spatial pattern of precipitation intensity (SDII) matches well between VR-CESM and references” at lines 271-272, we added (with spatial correlations around 0.85)”

f) SDII is referred to as the spatial pattern of precipitation intensity in the text (line 240) and table 1 lists as simple precipitation intensity index (precipitation amount/R1), where R1 is said to be number of days with more than 1mm of precipitation. These two sound very different, which one is correct?

Thanks for pointing out this. We need to clarify that SDII refers to the simple precipitation intensity index. The corresponding sentence has been rephrased to “… for the simple precipitation intensity index (SDII), its spatial pattern agrees well …” from “ … the spatial pattern of precipitation intensity (SDII) matches well …”.

g) It really doesn’t serve any purpose to provide figures for each of the R metrics from 1mm to 40mm. It would be best if we have the mean and the extreme (> 95 percentile) and the number of days with precipitation. This will make the figures more accessible to a reader and easier to understand.

Thanks for pointing out this. In order to achieve both meaningful and comprehensive analyses, a variety of relevant indices has been explored at the beginning as mentioned in the Methodology section. Those indices include the ones as defined by ETCCDI and other commonly used metrics covering different percentiles. From our standpoint, interpreting precipitation events with different intensities is more straightforward, relevant for societal impacts (Alexander et al., 2006), and informative to water resources management and climate adaptation studies. After all, flooding typically occurs when there is an intense precipitation episode over a short time frame. As part of the initial analyses, the percentiles do convey the signal of potentially shifted precipitation distribution, but did not add significant information to the indices we defined in the paper. The changes of the extreme in the scope of percentiles are also loosely imbedded in the frequency distributions of precipitation shown in Figure 9.

However, we agree that showing the percentile like 95th will assist the readers to get the sense of how the most extreme precipitation events are changing. As the mean and the number of days with precipitation have already included Figure 2 and Figure 6. Here, for a complimentary illustration, the 95th percentile (P95) based on all days over each simulation period is added in Figure 10 followed by the precipitation frequency distributions.

Again, the shift to more extreme precipitation is most pronounced as warming intensifies through the end of the 21st century over the northwest U.S. (P95 increased for about 20-30%). For dry regions, including the southwest and intermountain west, precipitation tends to be more extreme (P95 increased for about 15%) with the increase of the mean precipitation and number of rainy days (see Figure 7) from *hist* to *mid*. However, this trend is suppressed when the warming persists till the *end* over southern California and remaining southwest area where convective precipitation dominates. This is due to the insufficient compensation of air water vapor to the exponentially enlarged saturated vapor pressure.

In the manuscript, the following sentences were added from line 193 to line 195.

“From our standpoint, binning precipitation events by intensity is more intuitive than percentile, more relevant for societal impacts (Alexander et al. 2006), and more informative to water resources managers and climate adaptation strategies.”

Figure 10 is added. And from line 476-485, the following paragraph is added.

“In supplement to our results, the 95th percentile precipitation (P95) for all days over each simulation period is plotted in Figure 10, to provide additional clarity in how the most extreme precipitation events are changing. Again, the shift to more extreme precipitation is most pronounced over the northwest U.S. as warming intensifies through the end of the 21st century (P95 increased for about 20-30%). For dry regions, including the southwest and intermountain west, precipitation tends to be more extreme (P95 increased for about 15%) with the increase of both the mean precipitation and number of rainy days (see Figure 6) from *hist* to *mid*. However, this trend is suppressed over southern California and remaining southwestern region when the warming persists through *end*. In this region, where convective precipitation dominates, the increase in humidity does not keep pace with increases in saturated vapor pressure.”

Reference:

Alexander, L. V., X. Zhang, T. C. Peterson, J. Caesar, B. Gleason, A. M. G. Klein Tank, M. Haylock et al. "Global observed changes in daily climate extremes of temperature and precipitation." Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres 111, no. D5 (2006).

h) The increased number of extreme precipitation events noted in lines 250 262, is it something similar to observed in the CESM that is exaggerated by the VR CESM or a new feature that is present in VR CESM?

Thanks for pointing out this. For the suppressed SDII over the Great Plains during the warm season, it is also present in CESM and not significantly alleviated in VR-CESM. As for the exaggerated precipitation intensity over the western flank of the Sierra Nevada, this is indeed a new feature in VR-CESM, as CESM cannot even represent the orographic precipitation over the Sierra Nevada spatially.

i) The projected changes for the future timeslices – it would be helpful if you could put this in context of CMIP5 model results (either as table or a figure).

Thanks for the suggestion. Since Sillmann et al. (2013b) has already investigated changes of extreme indices covering precipitation aspects under RCP8.5 scenario based on CMIP5 ensemble over the 21st century to the reference period 1981-2000, here, we simply contrast our conclusions of VR-CESM simulations to theirs. Although they use ETCCDI indices and the time slices are not exact the same as ours, the comparisons still roughly hold. As suggested, a general table is given below for better illustration.

Table 1 General contrast of our findings to the CMIP5 model results as studied in Sillmann et al. (2013)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Indices** | **Sillmann et al. (2013)** | **Our study** |
| **Overall mean precipitation** | Projected to increase in the 21st century for PRCPTOT (total wet-day precipitation) and SDII by 9% and 12%, respectively, by year 2100, globally land-averaged, compared to the reference period 1981-2000. | Projected increasing trend holds for mean Pr and SDII in the future and intensifies through the end of 21st century (2075-2100) over most sub-regions of west U.S for about 20-30%, compared to the reference period 1980-2005. |
| **Precipitation extremes** | RX5day (monthly or annual maximum of 5-day precipitation accumulations) is projected to increase by 20%, representing a more extreme precipitation distribution across most regions (covering the west U.S. area). | For the most extreme precipitation events (Pr > 40 mm/day), there is a statistically significant increase along the northwest coast (≥ 60%), the Cascades (~50%) and Northern Rockies (≥ 60%) by end-of-century.  Significant increases are also apparent along the Klamath range in California of about 20-40% from *hist* to *end*. |
| **Precipitation contributions** | Contribution of very wet days (R95p, days with Pr greater than the 95th percentile of the wet days (Pr>1mm)) to the annual total wet-day precipitation has generally increased by the end of 21st century (period 2081-2100). | Changes in accumulated precipitation for these events are consistent with the change in their frequency. |

As for the model agreement within CMIP5 ensemble, Sillmann et al. (2013b) state that the changes in the precipitation indices are less consistent compared to the temperature indices. However, projected changes for the 2046–2065 period intensify toward the end of the century, with overall model agreement on the increases of total wet-day precipitation (PRCPTOT), very wet days (RX5day), R95p and the heavy precipitation days index (R10mm).

Sillmann et al. (2013a) also pointed out GCMs underestimate observed precipitation magnitudes both in the aspects of mean precipitation and precipitation extremes, further implying the necessity of downscaling techniques, as emphasized in the introduction part of our manuscripts.

Further discussion can also be found in the response to the first question of the other reviewer due to the relevance of these two comments, with the inclusion of CESM-LENS results and resolution effects.

The following sentences were added to the manuscripts from line 57 to 59 in the Introduction.

“Moreover, GCMs tend to underestimate observed precipitation magnitudes both in the aspects of mean precipitation and precipitation extremes, implying the necessity of downscaling techniques (Sillmann et al. 2013a).”

In the conclusion part, we added the sentences “Our results were generally consistent with previous studies that addressed changes in precipitation over the 21st century using CMIP5 simulations (i.e., Sillmann et al. (2013b)). However, by incorporating high resolution over the WUS, significantly more regional detail emerges with regards to a crucial enhancement of precipitation representations, especially in regions of complex topography.” at lines 555-559.

Reference:

Sillmann, J., V. V. Kharin, X. Zhang, F. W. Zwiers, and D. Bronaugh. "Climate extremes indices in the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble: Part 1. Model evaluation in the present climate." Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres 118, no. 4 (2013): 1716-1733.

Sillmann, J., V. V. Kharin, F. W. Zwiers, X. Zhang, and D. Bronaugh. "Climate extremes indices in the CMIP5 multimodel ensemble: Part 2. Future climate projections." Journal of Geophysical Research: Atmospheres 118, no. 6 (2013): 2473-2493.

**We would like to thank both reviewers again for taking the time and effort to provide your thoughtful and thorough commentary. We hope that these revisions have addressed your concerns and believe the quality of the manuscript has been greatly improved with your input.**

**Sincerely,**

**Xingying Huang and Paul Ullrich**