

Authors' answers to Reviewers' comments

We would like to thank both Reviewers for the comments and suggestions that helped improving the quality of the manuscript. The typos mentioned by the Reviewer #1 were corrected in the revised version. We didn't include the panels in Figure 2 with the PRISM and Stage IV interpolated at the 0.25-degree resolution as suggested by the Reviewer. We felt that the benefit of doing so was limited due to the fact that the differences are not visually noticeable for the entire CONUS (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1: Annual average precipitation derived from: a) PRISM, b) Stage IV at their native resolution (0.04°). Same thing re-gridded at 0.25°.

