Report#1:

Thank you for answering all my questions and comments. In particular, I think that it was important to define the difference between the catch ratio and the collection efficiency for clarity. Finally, I would suggest to delete the word 'obviously' on line 134.

Thanks, we have removed the word 'obviously' as suggested.

Report #2:

The authors have done a nice job of addressing the reviewer's comments in the first round of reviews. I do have a few additional things I would like to see the authors address.

1) If the authors are going to keep CE and CF, they need to define each of them in the paper. Many in the precipitation measurement community consider them to be the same so if the authors wish to define them differently, they need to do so in the manuscript.

The variables CE and CR are defined at lines 48-49 and 52-53, respectively.

2) I believe your figure numbers are off in the manuscript (there is no figure 3 for example).

I correctly see Figure 3 in my word manuscript, the problem is due to the generation of the pdf file. To avoid this problem, I've removed the automatically renumbering of figures.

3) Your equation numbers similarly need to be revisited (your first equation shows up as equation 14 now instead of equation 1).

The first equation is correctly labelled as Equation 1. The number 4 is barred because the equation was moved after the inversion of sub-sections 2.2 and 2.1, as requested during the first round of review.

4) The addition of Figure 1 is excellent. My only suggestion is that the arrows on 1b are so thin, it's hard to see where they are pointing to. I'd suggest making them thicker and/or changing the color.

Thanks, the figure was modified accordingly.

5) In Figure 1b, it might be useful to also depict the wind direction most commonly associated with the precipitation. I'm assuming it's from the bottom of the picture towards the top since the shorter gauges are located near the bottom of the picture? It would help alleviate any questions about wind impacts from the taller sensors on the shorter sensors.

A white arrow indicating the prevailing wind direction (about 100 degrees) is now included in Figure 1b. Therefore, wind mostly impacts from the lower to the taller sensors.

For the next revision, please check the figure labels ("Figure 1" appears twice)

I correctly see Figure 1 in my word manuscript, the problem is due to the generation of the pdf file. To avoid this problem, I've removed the automatically renumbering of figures.

Note from review file validation: