

## **General comments**

The authors have substantially improved the manuscript by removing the section on the MRR, reorganizing the text, clarifying the focus, and improving the figures. The responses to the reviewer comments are also excellent. I really appreciate the careful work by the authors, and I am pleased with the changes made to the manuscript. The paper now reads very well, and I truly enjoyed reading it. I have only a few minor comments and typos to point out.

## **Specific comments**

L. 153: It is unusual to introduce a figure by referring only to subfigure (b). Consider swapping (a) and (b). Also, it would be helpful to include the all-time average of monthly precipitation frequencies for daily >0 mm and daily >1 mm, in addition to the reported range.

L. 274: The word "stick" is a bit informal in scientific writing. Suggested revision: "we rely on the corrected Pluvio data."

Figure 6: The legend does not fully represent the figure. The black and dark gray bars appear with white fill inside. Please update the legend accordingly.

Table 3 caption: "the TS method" should likely be "the TMS method."