

Reply to editor

Comments to the Author:

Thanks for the revisions. I now find your manuscript acceptable for publication, but would like you to correct a few minor issues as described below.

Best regards,

Jan Seibert

We would like to thank the editor for the positive feedback and for the time he dedicated to this manuscript.

P2L8, weather forecasting, flood forecasting, and hydropower production

Please split up the references so that it is clear which refers to what aspect

The references are now specific to the different uses.

P4L11: S1, 1 should be subscript (also P7L31 and other places)

This was corrected in the whole manuscript.

P4L15: The time of the day at which the predictors are selected

‘for’ instead of ‘at’

This has been corrected.

P7L14 and P14L4: delete ‘very’ (we non-native speakers often use too many ‘very’, these two are examples of this)

This has been corrected.

P8: When adding the second level of analogy on moisture variables of the 2Z-2MI method (Table 2), the number of candidate situations for this level did not increase when using the original parameters because they were conditioned by the N1 previously selected analogues; however, their dates changed.

I am not sure I understand how the dates could change if ‘they’ were conditioned by previously selected analogues. Please clarify this sentence. (what exactly is ‘they’ referring to? It reads like ‘parameters, but I think you mean ‘analogues Sorry, confused)

We tried to clarify the meaning of this sentence : “When adding the second level of analogy on moisture variables of the 2Z-2MI method (Table 2), the number of candidate situations for this level did not increase when using the original parameters because the candidate situations were conditioned by the N1 previously selected analogues; however, their dates changed due to the introduction of the MTW on the first level of analogy.”