

Please address the comments of the referee.

Additionally: in the new version of manuscript you use the term "derivation ratio". Should it be perhaps the "deviation ratio"?

### Comments on the Abstract

---

estimates of a certain climatic variable are frequently seen  
-- unclear what do you mean by "seen"... where? By whom?

parallel datasets  
--- what does parallel mean?

Accompanying uncertainties evaluation with the ensemble is recommended while a fundamental flaw is that the uncertainties in temporal variation and spatial heterogeneity are not together considered for the final uncertainty estimate.

--- cumbersome formulation - please reformulate

Uc is higher than classic estimations metrics for the improvement of uncertainty estimation.

--- Unclear, why it is "for improvement"?

the new uncertainty estimate is more comprehensive than the classic ones as the components are partially identified by the classic metrics.

--- unclear formulation

Multiple precipitation products of different types (gauge-based, merged products and GCMs) are used to better explain and understand the peculiarity of the new methodology

--- unclear how e.g. gauges can explain the new methodology. Consider not using the word "peculiarity"

---

The comments above are about the Abstract. I can see similar problems in some other parts of the manuscript. This raises a concern, that the rest of the added and modified text in the manuscript would be also difficult to understand.

Therefore I encourage you to carefully read and revise the text again, giving attention to every sentence. Please also ask help from professional proof-reading services.