

Dear Dr. Kondo,

I have received three referee reports on the revised version of your paper. The referees are the same as those of the previous version (and identified by the same numbers).

Referee 3, who had asked for major revisions, considers the paper can be published as it stands.

Referee 2, who had asked for only minor revisions, considers some improvement is still necessary on the English of the paper. Here is his comment to the Editor *Technically, I'm fine with the manuscript. There is still some pretty rough language in places, especially in a few of the new sentences.*

Referee 1, who had asked for major revisions, is slightly more critical, and suggests a number of specific corrections. The first one of these is purely scientific. Most of the other ones have to do with editing, intended in particular at improving the English.

I agree with the referees, and intend to accept your paper, provided you correct it along the suggestions of referees 1 and 2. I agree with them in that the English, although perfectly understandable, must be improved in places. When accepted, your paper will be submitted to a free copy-editing, intended in particular at correcting the language. But the best would be, if you can, that you have it checked by a native English speaker.

I add a last comment. You quote as *Talagrand and Vautard* a paper of which I was a co-author. There were actually three authors to it, and the correct quotation is

O. Talagrand, R. Vautard and B. Strauss, 1999, Evaluation of Probabilistic Prediction Systems, Proceedings of Workshop on *Predictability*, European Centre for Medium-range Weather Forecasts, Reading, England, October 1997, 1-25.

I look forward to receiving the final version of your paper.