Dear editor,

We thank you and the anonymous reviewer for the helpful comments. Below we reply to the specific comments of the review and detail our changes in the document.

1 Replies to the specific comments

1) When authors discuss precipitation-vegetation-fire relationship, they miss a link between precipitation rate and lightning activity (thus, fire ignition) (see, e.g. Romps et al., doi: 10.1126/science.1259100). At least a short discussion on this point should be added to the paper.

The manuscript already included a discussion on the connection with lightning on p.16 l. 7-15. We add the recommended reference to this paragraph:

Lightning strikes are strongly related to precipitation (Romps et al., 2014).

2) Correlation coefficients in the Table 1 should be accompanied with statistical significance estimates (e.g. to show statistically significant coefficients with the bold font).

We indicate the significance with bold font now.

3) Figures 4, 6, and 7 are ‘blind’ and hard to read. Is it possible to increase dots and chose more contrast-to-white colors?

The student who prepared these figures left the institute a while ago. Although we agree that the contrast could be improved, we do not see a major problem in the graphical appearance of the graph and therefore keep it as it is.

4) The word ‘surprisingly’ (Introduction, Section 3.3) seems to be unsuitable since there was made no particular assumptions on any expectations.

We removed the word ‘surprisingly’.

5) English should be improved, mostly in terms of punctuation.

We corrected punctuation and language in some places, however, the journal offers also an editing service that is paid with the publication fees we therefore believe that the journal will take care of this.