Dear Topical Editor, dear Alexander Gruber,

Thank you for conditionally accepting our manuscript. Please find below a brief response to the minor comments addressed by Referee #2 in order for you to know what we did with the comments.

Yours sincerely,
Aart Overeem
Royal Netherlands Meteorological Institute

Topical Editor decision

Dear authors,

thank you for the revision of your manuscript, which addressed all concerns raised by the referees properly. Only Referee #2 has is asking for two small clarifications. Since these are very minor, I am willing to accept your manuscript and leave addressing these comments up to your discretion. I am sure your paper will make a valuable contribution to the community.

Best regards,
Alexander Gruber

Referee #2

I would recommend its publication after considering a couple of minor comments below.

Minor comments:
1. Introduction L53-67: This part intends to address the motivation/objectives of what has been done in EURACLIM and what for. However, it still lacks clarity in writing (e.g., because of addressing the possibility of a "real-time" application of Gabella clutter filter in the introduction, I expected to see the results produced in real-time for the filtering. Was the presented EURACLIM dataset generated in such a way applying the real-time filter? If not, this creates confusion. Indeed, L427-L432 does mention the possibility of applying it in (near) real-time in the context of future applications as a conclusion. Also, some detailed setup/statements regarding cloud type, E-OBS, and computation of clutter mask seem to suit better as the "summary" in the conclusion section. So, a revision/rephrasing can help readers.
We clarified the part in the Introduction referring to a possible real-time application of the Gabella clutter filter. We think it is better to keep the setup/statements. In our opinion, these are not too detailed, but help the reader right from the beginning to understand the basic processing of EURADCLIM.

2. Table 1: As the authors answered (#14-minor comments), if the comparisons are done based on the reference dataset (the same pair of radar and gauge for four different filters), the number of pairs (indicated "n", right? Please add its description in the table as well) for each threshold should be the same for different filters (as seen in the mean). Why is the n different?
We clarified Table 1 accordingly. The differences in the value of n were almost entirely related to slightly different verification periods. Now we select exactly the same period as for the

EURADCLIM datasets. There are still some differences in the number of radar-gauge pairs, but now they have become very minor.