# Interactive comment on "Performance of post-processing algorithms for rainfall intensity measurements of tipping-bucket rain gauges" by M. Stagnaro et al. (Reply to Referee #3).

Matteo Colli<sup>1,2</sup>, Mattia Stagnaro<sup>1,2</sup>, Luca G. Lanza<sup>1,2</sup>, and P.W. Chan<sup>3</sup>

Correspondence to: Mattia Stagnaro (Mattia.Stagnaro@unige.it)

We would like to thank referee #3 for his/her constructive comments. Below we report the referee comments in bold and our answer. A revised version of the manuscript, containing the reviewer's suggestion, is provided in the supplement of a separate comment.

### Abstract. I suggest to include in the abstract the numerical values of the RI interval where the impact of the algorithm is more relevant.

Following the referee suggestion, we added the RI interval  $(6-50 \text{ mmh}^{-1})$  where the inter-tip algorithm shows the most relevant effects.

#### Section 2. The relative distance between the three instruments should be indicated here.

Following the suggestion of referee #1 a brief description of the test field site has been added in the revised version of the manuscript, including the distance information (see comment c - Section 2 of the reply to Referee #1).

## Lines 22 and 26 (and throughout the paper), please be consistent with the labeling of the OSK data (OSK or DC or REF).

The manuscript has been reviewed and the term OSK has been chosen to identify the drop-counter reference throughout the paper.

### Section 3. In equation 1 and 2 a summation notation should be used, and in equation 2 the second member should be multiplied by 100.

Equation 1 represents the relative difference between the one-minute RI instrumental measurement ( $RI_m$ ) and the reference one-minute RI value. This calculation has been performed for each minute of all the events here considered.

Equation 2 indicates the calculation of the standardized one-minute RI. No summation notation is needed in the formulas because they are used to calculate each one-minute value, rather than any integral (or average) quantity.

The request from the reviewer may arise from the use of the percentage notation in Eq. 2, which is a typo from the first draft of the manuscript and is now deleted from the revised version.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>University of Genova, Department of Civil, Chemical and Environmental Engineering, Via Montallegro 1, 16145 Genova, Italy

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>WMO/CIMO Lead Centre "Benedetto Castelli" on Precipitation Intensity, Italy

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Hong Kong Observatory, 134A Nathan Road, Honk Kong, China

#### Figure 7 is a 3-panel figure, please describe in the caption all panels and put labels accordingly.

Figure 7 has been re-edited and the labels have been added to each panel of the figure. The lower panel (c) description has been added in the caption of the figure.