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All three reviewers appreciated the study, and I agree with them that the work represents an interesting and important contribution. Some valid concerns are raised in their thorough and insightful reviews, and the authors have provided good indications of how they will address these concerns. In preparing a revised manuscript, I would encourage the authors to focus particularly on a few points which many of the reviewers’ comments group around. Also, there remain small English usage errors throughout (some but not all mentioned by the reviewers).

- Interpretation of identified extreme seasons, mentioned in detail by R2 and also touched on by R1 (anomalous vs extreme) and R3 (rescaling). I believe it would be worth spending some more time to put results from this method in context of results from conventional approaches (R2 comment #1), which would also go towards highlighting the impact/novelty of this study.
- Clarification of methodology (all reviewers), including the choice of winter case studies only
- Sharpening of the presentation (e.g., many nice suggestions from R2, R3 regarding framing questions). I agree with the authors that the length is fine, especially given the amount of work that has been done, but the text could be edited to better guide the reader to the main messages. It could help also in the abstract and conclusions to put more weight on what we learn about point #1 and less weight on details of the case studies.