We would like to thank the referee for the feedback on our manuscript and pointing out the few remaining technical issues. We have taken the comments into account , as can be seen below.

We separated the different comments, shown in *italic,* from our replies (in regular font) below. In **bold** we provide our revised text.

Personal preference – Fig. 9: Remove all points within the IQR and only plot those outside the whiskers.

We agree that this improves clarity of the figure. Hence, we removed the points within the IQR and only plotted those only outside the whiskers.

Line 11 – "underestimates" (spelling correction).

Thanks for catching this spelling error. We changed "underestimate" to "underestimates" in line 12.

Line 74 – Add a comma after "sampling".

We checked all 11 occurrences of the word "sampling" in our manuscript, however, we were not able to find the instance where the comma was lacking.

Line 142 – Consider adding one sentence on whether and how larger data values after a gap could be used safely—e.g., by disaggregating with a nearby PWS/AWS/radar time series?

We agree that this would be useful information for the reader. Hence we added this sentence (see lines 202-203): "Disaggregating this type of high influx using reliable rainfall timeseries from nearby stations could potentially solve this issue."