Reviewer comments

I appreciate the great work by the authors in this revised manuscript. The authors discussed the contributions and limitations more thoroughly. The comparison and validation of the BR-SRG dataset with other sources are also more reasonable than in the previous manuscript. I have some minor comments as follows:

Abstract and conclusions:

There are only 2 selected events in the comparison with AGCD. In Cyclone Ellie, the authors explain the difference between BR-SRG and AGCD in lines 729-732. But the conclusion in lines 902- 903 ("*The blended analyses also showed good agreement with the daily operational AGCD product*") contradicts what was explained previously. I think this conclusion can be excluded from the Conclusions section.

Only two events were selected for the comparison with AGCD. For Cyclone Ellie, the authors explain the difference between BR-SRG and AGCD in lines 729–732. However, the statement in lines 902–903 ("The blended analyses also showed good agreement with the daily operational AGCD product") contradicts this explanation. I think this statement should be removed from the Conclusions section.

Reference list: Please check the in-text citations and reference list. There are duplicate references.

Line 110: "grided" rainfall -> "gridded"

Line 171: There is a mismatch in the total number of daily gauges (within radar + outside = 3569, not 3659). Please check again.

Line 228: increase -> increases

Line 245: background filed -> background field

Fig. 9 vs lines 701–708**:** The text says correlation is high "particularly where gauge density is higher" and RMSE is lower in well-observed areas. Fig. 9 shows the densely gauged SW Western Australia cluster with visibly lower correlation and higher RMSE. I think this should be pointed out in the text and explained further.

Line 780: Please write out the full word for ME in section 5.2, as I think it wasn't explained before line 780.

Lines 830 - 831: The figure for Cyclone Jasper was shown in Fig. 14b, not 14a. Similarly for Cyclone Ellie. Please check the text again.