

Chers Collègues,

Three referees have now submitted their reviews of your paper, and the open discussion has been closed. The three referees recommend acceptance of the paper subject to minor revisions, and make specific suggestions in that respect.

You have been requested to respond to the referees' comments by 25 August next. I encourage you, as I presume you have already started to do, to prepare a new version of the paper, taking into account the comments and suggestions of the three referees. Implementing some of these suggestions will require some work from you (for instance, referee 3's recent suggestion to implement EMOS with rainfall and temperature based predictors). But I think these suggestions are appropriate.

You may submit your revised version either with your response to the referees' comments, or at a later stage. In any case, please respond precisely at some stage to all of the referees' comments and suggestions. Should you disagree with a particular comment, or decide not to follow a particular suggestion, please state precisely your reasons for that.

I have as Editor suggestions for a few minor changes

L. 2, *Météo-France* (with accents)

L. 111, *CDF* not defined at this stage. Give the expansion there.

L. 191, *An important observed HN* For what I know, the word *important* cannot in English mean *numerically large*. Change to *A large observed ...* (similarly, on l. 10, I suggest you change to *The gain of performance is large ... or is significant ...*)