

The manuscript has been improved with additional explanations of the methods and limitations since last reviewed. I believe that the conclusions are correct, however I still have some comments about the analysis used, particularly for table 5.

Major comments

Table 5, lines 269-276: The authors have clearly addressed the different altitudes over which warming amplification was detected. However I am still concerned about the use of different elevations to determine significant trends. The authors point to studies where EDW was found at high elevations only, and I would suggest that they conduct similar analysis to form a stronger and more meaningful conclusion. If there is a suggestion that altitude dependent warming occurs above a certain threshold (in the discussion, you suggest 4500 m), that threshold can be chosen and all trends analysed on the same grid points above the threshold. Even if this results in fewer significant trends, I believe it will result in more meaningful conclusions. Where many trends are fitted and significant ones are chosen, it increases the likelihood that those that appear significant have occurred by chance. I think the authors have made this clear and evident in their conclusions, but that the analysis could be more focussed to support these conclusions.

Figure 5: It is not clear to me the advantage of showing one transect where elevation and warming trends are both increasing in the subplots. The transects shown here do not give an indication of whether the elevation is the determining factor, just that (e.g. in figure 5), both elevation and temperature trends increase from west to east. The figure 1 included in the authors response suggests to me that there may be many transects where the temperature trend is decreasing with altitude, indicating there may be another control on warming rates, rather than elevation. I would suggest these subplots are removed, or changed to plots of elevation versus temperature trend over the entire sub-region.

Table 2: I can't quite work out what this is showing, what is the significance of, and where are the different significance levels? Is this the percentage of grid points in the entire CTM that show significant warming trends? If so, which significance level is being used?

Minor comments

Line 179: please make it clear here that while the 6-hourly data were aggregated to monthly, seasonal and annual time scales, Tmin and Tmax were picked as one of the 4 available UTC times (and which these were). Similarly for line 197

Line 209: grammatical error: " WCC and LCC that represented by excluding the CTM and the QTP from the WCC" -> "WCC and LCC which is represented by excluding the CTM and the QTP from the WCC". Also a general note, that removing some of the acronyms in this paper would greatly improve readability.

Figures 5-6: Please indicate either in the figure captions how the place names correspond to the zones (e.g. where is the Ili valley, Tolm mountains?)