

Dear Authors

thank you for the responses to the comments by referee 1 and the respective revisions.

Dear Editor,

We would like to thank you for your prompt reviewing process. We have considered the points suggested by you in the revised manuscript accordingly. We also found a few additional typing errors, which have now been fixed and visible with track changes. Also, figure #1 have been updated to allow readers with colour vision deficiencies correctly, as requested by the publisher.

Best regards,

Joyson & co-authors

I went quickly through the material and have the following comments:

in general consider speaking of "extreme weather" or "weather extremes" rather than climate extremes.

Thank you for the comment. We changed this throughout the manuscript.

15 - compared to your response letter you added "site which exhibited comparable values" after "while no significant change was seen at the Street" which is redundant.

We removed the line "which exhibited comparable values" as suggested.

70- "which further limits" - consider either "which may limit" or "which was shown to limit (REF)".

We changed this as suggested.

73- "in one of two ways:" can be omitted without loss (either or says exactly this)

We have omitted the words and changed the text as follows:

L73: "A tree usually responds to drought either by avoiding a significant decrease in water potential and relative water content through stomatal closure at the cost of reduced photosynthesis"

Tab. 1 and 474 : please avoid common language "fairly" and consider "mildly" as opposing to "strongly"

We changed this throughout the manuscript.

116- consider replacing "diverse" by "contrasting" or "characteristic"

We changed this to contrasting.

352 - if you agree, "uptake" would be a better term than "use"

We prefer to keep the term "use"

490 - keeping the long discussion about this in mind consider adding something like "This finding demonstrated that meteorological definitions of weather extremes must not be necessarily directly translate into extreme biological responses."

And maybe even - the Scandinavian perspective of what a heatwave can look like (rare T_{air} events at levels far lower than experienced in lower latitudes)

We fully agree with the editor's suggestion. Hence, we have the following lines in the conclusion section.

L423-425: "Our finding demonstrated that meteorological definitions of weather extremes must not be necessarily directly translate into extreme biological responses and also the Nordic perspective on a heatwave is characterized by rare occurrences of air temperatures significantly lower than those seen in lower latitudes."

With kind regards,
Andreas

Additional private note (visible to authors and reviewers only):

Hi Joyson and Co-authors,

although my comments are mainly non-technical, I have chosen "Publish subject to technical corrections". I did that to speed things up and I leave it to your own decisions, which of the comments you deem relevant to revise.

Please do not interpret my decisions in a way that I wasn't interested in a further discussion about these points with you.

Best wishes,
Andreas

Thank you again for your support and constructive suggestions.