

The authors have provided a detailed response with respect to comments 1, 2 and 5 of the first report. However, some issues remain with the third and fourth comments:

- 3 I appreciate the author's enthusiasm in providing detailed computation time analysis for their implementations. This, however being interesting, is out of place and just a comment on the computational price of the added assets would have been enough. I will not dwell on this point any further, but the authors might want to clarify how exactly this time consumption analysis is generated and how such a large computational load ( $\sim 10-20\%$ ) is justified. The authors could also improve their manuscript concerning the behaviour of their splittings especially with regards to their treatment of EW soft-singularities.
- 4 Figure 12 of the manuscript, although outlining the efficiency of the utilized veto algorithm, does not showcase its effectiveness in different scenarios. It would be particularly interesting to see other observables in this context, e.g. the transverse momentum distributions of these events. Another interesting observation could be a comparison between say, explicit  $VV + 2j$  against  $2j$  with parton shower. The latter would particularly show how much EW background is expected from pure QCD radiations in EW-sensitive phase space.

The above modifications should not be taxing for the authors and after being considered, I will recommend the publication of this paper in SciPost.