

The authors have thoroughly addressed concerns and remarks from the reviewers. As a consequence, the paper has been modified and improved considerably.

However, I believe that some other corrections and/or clarifications are needed before publication.

The specific comments are as follows:

1. The exact period and dates of the comparison between the two AWS should be emphasized in the text. It is only reported in the abstract, while, in line 102, it is worth wondering whether these dates correspond only to the scale of the scatterplots or are instead the actual period of comparison.
2. Clarifications appear necessary about the general evaluation of the 3D-Printed WS. Also, the shortcoming of the durability of the low-cost sensors, as well as of the 3D-Printed WS, should be highlighted.

I mean: the comparison lasted eight months. Temperature sensor began to fail in month seven; RH sensor in month six; Atmospheric pressure sensor was replaced at the beginning and then suffered some communication problems. Wind speed sensor worked well until month 7, whereas wind vane was problematic for the entire period. Solar radiation sensor suffered from different bias (before high and then low). Rain gauge tended towards high bias starting from month seven. Because of this, some conclusions appear to be pretty daring. Some of the low-cost sensors worked very well but for a limited period of the comparison. Furthermore, 3D printed parts gave some concerns in terms of durability. Hence, the limited time in which these low-cost sensors can serve as viable alternatives to commercial weather stations should be pointed out.

3. Line 193: You mean the maximum rain rate of the heavy precipitation event, I guess. If so, it should be added.

Typos:

Line 47 "are"

Line 79: "Raspberry" for consistency

Line 127: "are"

Line 161: "extend"

Line 216: "is"

Line 229: "low-cost" for consistency

Line 233: "is"