Dear Thomas,

We thank you sincerely for your thorough reading of our answers and for your relevant comments. Please find bellow a point-by-point response to all the comments. Editor comments are in tables with blue background, and our responses are in tables with orange background.

All the best,

Titouan and co-authors.

Comments from the handling editor (Thomas Mölg)

EC1: Modified Figure 1 appears to have two panels labelled (c) - please correct.

REC1: The error was corrected

EC2: Figure A2 caption: I feel the description of what the "ratio" means is overcomplicated/unclear. Please try to define the ratio in even simpler terms.

REC2: The caption indeed lacks of clarity. Modified to:

"Figure A2: Ratios of mean monthly precipitation between different locations (Paiku/Yala, Golojang/Yala, Golojang/Paiku), calculated from ERA5-Land data for the period 1992–2021. Each point represents the mean ratio for a given month, and the error bars indicate ±1 standard deviation of monthly precipitation over the 30-year period"

EC3: "even though observational networks ... (Lundquist et al., 2019)." -- I am not sure that what you write is really the key statement of the Lundquist paper. Please re-think this half sentence critically and modify if needed. You probably have to define "observational" more precisely (I guess you mean in-situ measurements?

REC3: You are right that our citation of Lundquist et al. 2019 did not fit with the main message of the paper. We rewrote the sentence and removed the reference to the Lundquist paper: I205" [...] because our results suggest that such gradients can exist. Previous studies demonstrated that high resolution modeling can present large positive biases (He et al. 2019). More in situ recordings are still needed to determine whether the large gradients in CPTP product around the study area are realistic or exaggerated, although in situ observation networks are never perfectly fitted to evaluate model precipitation."

In addition, we added another mention to orographic precipitation as suggested by referee #1 in the introduction of they comment:

I200 "In particular, they show relatively high precipitation on the highest parts of the study area, mainly above 5000 m a.s.l., and on the southern slopes of the Himalayas, as expected for orographic precipitation (Roe et al. 2005)."