

Review of seNorge_2018, daily precipitation and temperature datasets over Norway by Christian Lussana et al.

The authors have taken the pair of reviews and made substantive revisions to the manuscript that overall substantively improve readability of the piece as a whole. I have a number of queries and suggestions which should be considered prior to publication.

Major comments

1. At page 4 line 24-25 allusion is made to site exposures. A reader requires a reference to documentation of the site exposure method and further elucidation as to how, specifically, these were used.
2. The issue in p.7 line 4 over nomenclature persists. One of the X_i should be X_j surely and there should be a j th row or column?
3. The example application for precipitation discussed in section 4 relates to vigorous large circulation cyclonic precipitation event which, naively, your method may perform best at. While it is understandable that you wish to show a high skill example it may also give a misleading impression. At a minimum this should be acknowledged. Ideally a more challenging situation such as a summer convective event should also be shown.
4. Why is the section 5.3 analysis limited to winter? Surely it would be valuable to show this for at least summer in addition, if not all seasons to build user confidence and understanding of the product strengths and limitations?
5. Generally the figure captions are too short. Often text should be moved from the main body to the caption. The figure captions need to provide all information necessary for a reader to understand and interpret the figure and oftentimes this is missing.

Minor comments

1. Given the caveats rightly stated in the discussion the abstract at lines 11-12 on page 1 seems a bit unduly definitive?
2. P.3 line 21 described and discusses -> described and discussed
3. P.4 line 13 so to -> so as to
4. P.4 line 20 as precipitation -> as the precipitation
5. P.6 line 14 tend -> Tends?
6. Much of the paragraph starting p.6 line 28 should be moved to the figure caption rather than the text. Also: IDI equals to -> IDI equal to

7. I would provide a very brief synopsis of the section 6 discussion at p.7 line 15-16
8. P.9 line 31 so to transform -> either to transform OR so as to transform
9. P.13 lines. 18-20 should be in an expanded figure caption instead of the main text.
10. Please rephrase p.13 line 24 – it should not be about belief.
11. P.15 line 4 In this paragraph -> Next
12. Figure 3 caption projection of the differences is, I assume, an error, but I'm not sure what you actually intend to state here.
13. Figure 4 caption. Is the colour bar dimensionless units? If so state so. If not then give the units. Regardless please clarify the caption.
14. Figure 5 caption. Please help the reader out here. Are larger or smaller scales preferable? How does this scale partition between the methodological aspects and the event specific aspects? The event in question is a large cyclonic event which may have broad spatial scales. To what extent are the scales shown here a result of the event specific nature instead of the method? Intuitively the two must be intertwined and may be remedied by showing e.g. a summer convective event as suggested in major comments.
15. Figure 8 caption should end: See Fig 7 caption for further details.
16. Figure 13 lower right panel RR -> RR DJF for consistency with remaining panels