

At the outset, the author wants to thank the reviewer for his patience in reading and suggesting improvements to the manuscript.

Reviewer#2

Comment: Line 65: The errors and artefacts are not essential, understanding them is. Please rephrase.

Reply: *The text is modified as follows.*

“The artefacts and instrument errors associated with various kinds of disdrometers mentioned above need to be quantified as they propagate to the retrievals of radar geophysical parameters (Adirosi et al., 2018) and, in turn, in surface rainfall from weather radars (both polarimetric and non-polarimetric).”

Comment: Line 76: Please include a reference for these facts about JWD.

Reply: *The reference Joss and Waldvogel (1967), is added in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: Line 118: The authors state “The thresholds are considered from the previous studies mentioned in Radhakrishna and Rao (2010) and references therein” yet the reference is not included in the manuscript. Please include it here to justify the threshold choices.

Reply: *The reference is added in the revised manuscript.*

Comment: Line 125: As I mentioned, the authors need to state that this equation for reflectivity is only for the Rayleigh regime.

Reply: *The text is included in the revised manuscript.*

“The estimated $N(D)$ is used to calculate rain rate (R), reflectivity (Z) assuming Rayleigh approximation, D_m , and normalized intercept parameter (N_w) using the following relations.”

Comment: Line 149: The wavelength requires a unit in this description.

Reply: *the units are added to the revised manuscript.*

Comment: Figure 1: The figure requires axis labels.

Reply: *The axis labels are added to Fig. 1.*

Comment: Figure 8: The significance of the fitted lines is not discussed -- all fits in the paper should have their statistical significance indicated.

Reply: *The significance levels are mentioned in the figure captions wherever (Figs. 7, 8, and 9) required.*

At the outset, the Author profoundly thanks Dr. Zamin A. Kanji, Associate editor, AMT for his positive and timely responses and handling of this manuscript reviews.

Associate Editor

Comments to the author: As seen from the positive reviewer reports, they are satisfied with the revisions you have made to the manuscript. Reviewer 2 has recommended minor revisions. Please address those concerns before we can proceed further with publication. These concerns are small and should not take much time. In case you disagree with any of the comments, please submit a response explaining why. This will be important to move forward with accepting the manuscript for final publication in AMT.

Reply: *All the comments/suggestions of Reviewer#2 are implemented in the revised manuscript.*