Dear Referee,

we thank you very much for your second revision and final suggestions for improving the manuscript.

In particular, concerning remark 1

1. *Page 17, par 20-26:* It would be interesting to explain what part of the computational cost corresponds to the post-processing routine. The computational cost of the both models (WRF-Sfire and LSFire+) is detailed, but it is not clear if this includes the RandomFront computational cost or not.

we have included the following lines:

The 80% of the computational cost in both cases, i.e., WRF-Sfire and LSFire+, is due to the post-processing routine RandomFront 2.3. This computational time can be reduced in the future through a further code optimisation.

and concerning remark 2

2. *Figures 1-3 captions should include an explanation about the meaning of dashed lines, this is explained in the text, but I suggest adding it in the captions too.*

we have included in the captions of Figures 1-3 the following line:

Firefront is reported by a dashed line.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely Yours,
The authors
List of Changes

1. At page 17, at the end of the section “Code availability” we have included the following lines:

*The 80% of the computational cost in both cases, i.e., WRF-Sfire and LSFire+, is due to the post-processing routine RandomFront 2.3. This computational time can be reduced in the future through a further code optimisation.*

2. In the captions of Figures 1-3 we have included the following line:

*Firefront is reported by a dashed line.*