

We thank the referees for their comments on the manuscript and for the many useful suggestions that helped us in preparing an improved version of the manuscript.

In the following, we address their comments.

**Main comment 1 of referee #2:**

I agree that the focus should be on those members that work well. However, I still think that the others simulations should be mentioned from time to time. For instance, the abstract just says "those simulations" without giving a number. At this point it would be interesting for the reader whether this was 1 or 20 members. I do not think it needs a lot of detailed analyses, but it is important to keep that selection process always in mind.

**Reply: agreed. Two sentences have been added to the new manuscript version, see line 27 and lines 270-272.**

**Main comment 3 of referee #2:**

The figures in the revised version are still of varying quality. Those figures (Fig. 2 to 4) that were taken directly from the NOAA/ESRL plotting tools website (Figs 2-4) contrast with the other ones. I fear that coast lines will hardly be recognizable in print, and the same might hold for the contour labels.

**Reply: agreed. Figures 2, 3, 4 have been redrawn.**