

In the third draft, the authors of "Impact of bias nonstationarity on the performance of uni- and multivariate bias-adjusting methods: a case study on data from Uccle, Belgium" took into account all my comments in a satisfactory way, including 1) the improvement of the design experiment to compare the different bias correction methods properly, 2) the description of Rank Resampling for Distributions and Dependences, 3) the improvement of section 4.1 "Bias change". These modifications improve the manuscript. I appreciate the work done by the authors to modify the initial draft.

However, the second reviewer mentioned the issue that the evaluation has been done only for one cell and a single model. I agree with the second reviewer that this issue is key to (potentially) reach a firm conclusion on the performance of univariate and multivariate bias correction methods, which is not the case in the present study. Indeed, drawing conclusions on the performance of these statistical methods using only one grid point seems to be subject to much uncertainty.

From my point of view, this point is so important and should be considered in a future version, to provide clearer conclusions to end-users.

Specific comments:

- Figure 1: the panel (f) is missing.
- After the different modifications during the peer-reviewing process, I found the final submission very detailed, which is quite interesting, but makes it sometimes difficult to read. From my personal point of view, an effort to be concise must be made, so that readers do not have problems following the manuscript. In particular, are there strong differences of conclusions between 4.2-4.4? Would gathering the results and summarizing concisely the conclusions obtained possible (and preferable)?
- I often found it hard to link the information given by the subsection 4.1 Bias Change, and the other sections 4.2-4.7 giving the results for the performance of the methods while this link is the core of the study.