

Response to the technical corrections

We thank both referees for reviewing our article. We answer technical corrections of the referee #1 below. Our answers are in **bold**.

I have had the opportunity to review the first draft of this manuscript and I appreciate the changes and improvements the authors have made in this second draft. I do not see major issues in this version but rather some minor, mostly textual changes which I listed below.

Comments (line numbers refer to the tracked changes manuscript)

l. 8-10: The two sentences are repetitive regarding the data quality, I suggest to delete the second one.

The second sentence was deleted.

l. 15: To give examples of the potential of CML rainfall estimates the country-wide analysis for Germany and the Netherlands could be referenced here. (Graf et al., 2020; Overeem et al., 2016)

References were added.

l. 17: Rephrase to: "CMLs can observe..."

Rephrased.

l. 43-45: The data quality section should also be mentioned here

The data quality section was mentioned in the text.

The changes are in red:

"...experimental campaign, and structure of the collected datafiles, and discuss data quality and reliability. The third..."

l. 49: rephrase to: "The attenuation of a CML signal is related to the drop size distribution along its path. The observed attenuation can be used to calculate the rain rate between the two end nodes of a CML."

Rephrased.

l. 68: rephrase to "volume in a drop diameter interval"

Rephrased.

l. 78: please use "CML" or "microwave link" throughout the manuscript

"CML" replaced "microwave link" here and also in several other parts in the text.

l. 84: rephrase sentence

The changes are in red:

"~~For the campaign were also used~~ Three tipping bucket rain gauges were also used at sites 2, 4 and 5 (Table 1)."

l. 101: the abbreviation "EM" is undefined

Abbreviation explained when used for the first time in text.

l. 104: rephrase to: "The CML path was not horizontal"

Rephrased.

I.116: rephrase the second part of the sentence

The changes are in red:

“The cob webs were not specifically prevented and they were not observed during the field visits ~~were not observed.~~”

Caption Figure 2: MiniLink is written in a different way than on I. 97

“MINI-LINK” is now used consistently in the manuscript.

I. 146: rephrase to “sheets could unfortunately not be compiled from”

Rephrased.

I. 167: add a comma after “sunlight duration”

Added.

I. 167: replace time step with resolution as this word is used before

Replaced.

Section 2.5: refer to Appendix J in this section

Following sentence was added to the end of this section:

“The Appendix J presents the data availability of the devices during the campaign period.”

I. 246: replace “built environments“ with “surrounding buildings”

Replaced.

I. 255: rephrase the sentence “If we wanted to get ..” as it is too colloquial

The changes are in red:

“~~If we wanted to get more insight into this, we would need h~~Heated antennas **would be needed to prevent the formation of dew and/or air blowers ~~to~~ **would** blow away the water during fog events.”**

I. 257: state why it remains a challenge

The changes are in red:

However, modelling these effects remains challenging, ~~since the dew-related wetting depends on the weather conditions, as well as on the condition/presence of hydrophobic radome cover.~~

I. 274: delete “the”

Deleted.

I. 302: replace “inputting” with “interpolating”

Replaced.

I. 341: delete the redundant “and”

Deleted.

Graf, M., Chwala, C., Polz, J., & Kunstmann, H. (2020). Rainfall estimation from a German-wide commercial microwave link network: Optimized processing and validation for 1 year of data. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 24(6), 2931–2950.

<https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-24-2931-2020>

Overeem, A., Leijnse, H., & Uijlenhoet, R. (2016). Two and a half years of country-wide rainfall maps using radio links from commercial cellular telecommunication networks. *Water Resources Research*, 52(10), 8039–8065. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016WR019412>