

Specific remarks:

Page 3896, Abstract line 10 (and also Page 3902, line 5-6):

"The rainfall reconstruction showed major variability similar to natural variability." The meaning of this statement is unclear, both in the abstract and in the text. How are "natural variability", "major variability" and "similar" defined?

Abstract line 14: What do "other studies" mean? Do the authors mean other results? SLP should be defined, either here or later.

Page 3897, line 8. A paper doesn't analyse. "Analyses are presented in...", perhaps. Line 14 and elsewhere, should use the full word "years" in text.

Page 3898, line 11. This sentence isn't clear.

Page 3898, First paragraph of data: This is interesting background but is it directly relevant to the paper? A more thorough discussion of the data, such as examples of typical weather descriptions found in the documents, and the limits of the data found in the documents would be useful here.

Page 3898, line 23. How can averages (over which period?) be approximate?

Line 24-25: Briefly describe the influence of the NAO, either here or in the introduction, so readers know how it relates to this study and why it is important.

Page 3900, line 11. This is a very short period. Why not try to adjust the data, or try different homogeneous periods (1926-1958) to see how this affects the estimates? This could provide some measurement of uncertainty. While the series itself may have an inhomogeneity, how did authors decide that 1960-1990 is the best period to use, as opposed to the presumably homogeneous sub-periods of 1926-1958, or 1959-2007?

Lines 22-24: Is this a reasonable assumption given the characteristics of rainfall in this region? That is, do intermittent rain or trace amounts tend to fall over a week, as compared to two days of heavy rainfall? It might be interesting to look at the modern daily rainfall characteristics for those unfamiliar with the precipitation regimes of the Iberian Peninsula (as I am).

Page 3901, line 15-20:

As far as I understand these sentences, the authors are connecting the index values from 1750-1840 directly with the period 1960-1990. In this case, they will be "tuning" their 1750-1840 values to the 1960-90 period. It would be very surprising if they don't find that the earlier period has similar characteristics to the modern; they are ensuring it with this method. They need to explain why they would expect the precipitation characteristics (distribution, amount, seasonality) not to have changed between the two periods. What is their reasoning to assume that long term precipitation is a conserved quantity?

Page 3902, lines 5-6: How is the natural variability defined? How is this similarity evaluated? See earlier comment.

Line 12: How do the authors justify this level of precision? What are the error estimates?

Last paragraph: You can't really compare 4 years of low rainfall with 40 years and say this is a good agreement. What are the correlation coefficients? The low rainfall of Guiot from 1779-1798 also covers the wet period in Zafra of 1782-1789.

p3903, lines 15-16. This is a very vague statement. The "quality" and "reproduction" seem to be based on visual examinations of the time series. While there does seem to be some agreement, these statements should be quantified with statistical estimates of similarity.

p3906, line 10. As in previous comments, the "confirmation of the reliability" seems overstated given the lack of statistical testing. Is this conclusion based only on a visual inspection of Figure 6b?

line 22: One would hope that the extreme cases would be reproduced. It is the intermediate values which may be more difficult to reconstruct.

Line 15. The authors should put some kind of numbers to the plots, especially in Figure 7. It's difficult to tell exactly what they're trying to show with the NAO, and how they decide which NAO "works" best with their series from the scatter plots. Given this, and the lack of quantitative evidence as to the reliability of their index, it is premature to conclude that the rainfall index as presented here could improve the NAO estimates.