

The paper presented a two-yr research about the quality of rainwater in Poland, aiming to provide a reference for economic use. Basic physical, chemical and biological parameters were tested. Rain water is potentially a great fresh water resource for drinking purposes, and with climate change and rainfall regime shift, the study has its own significance. I also appreciate the authors doing long-term field research which is time consuming, and value the intellectual merit of the work. However, the manuscript seems to be submitted without proofreading. The headings and subheadings are messed up. The figure numbers do not align with the numbers in the text. The introduction was not able to put the research into context, and did not well express the significance. Overall, the paper is not ready for publication yet.

Below are a few examples of minor issues here and there.

Throughout the paper, please do not use “,” to replace “.” In numbers with significant digits.

In most of the figures, add the elements or parameters you measured to the vertical axis titles.

Page 1: line 17. Change “basing” to “based”

Line 20: The sentence is unclear. What does a “decreased pH” mean, comparing to what?

Line 25: What does the unit “M” mean?

Page 2: Line 1-2. Was this data for the whole globe, or for Poland? Not clear.

Page 2: Line 13: i.e., or e.g.?

Page 2: Line 15. Grammar issues

Line 18: grammar

Fig 1. A large figure with little useful information.

Fig. 2. RA means research area? If so, state it the text. What does “PP” mean?

Page 5: Section numbers messed up.

Page 6: explain why only less than half of the rain events were analyzed

Page 5: statements of turbidity do not agree with Figure 4.

Page 10: Figure 5 and 6 were nutrients and TOC, not metals!!!!!!!!!!!!!!