

Response to Reviewer's Comments

Comment: The authors have successfully addressed each reviewer's comments, which has significantly improved the manuscript. However, I do have some concerns, which I think authors can address before the manuscript is accepted.

Response: Thank you for your additional comments. Please find below our response summarizing how we addressed these comments.

Comment: In the abstract and Lines 442-445, authors recommend that post-processing calibration techniques via the use of near-real time products, (e.g., IMERG Early) that could improve the performance of GFS. However, I still think that the authors could not simply state that the performance of post-processed GFS could be improved over some regions via comparison of the performance of GFS and IMERG Early productions, despite the performance of IMERG Early productions is better than that of GFS. Please clarify.

Response: Agreed. We have removed the statement from the abstract.

Comment: Figure 8, please add the significance level for the R.

Response: For Figure 8, we have added the standard error. The p-values in all cases are less than 0.001; we prefer to show the standard error as these may be more meaningful.

Comment: Lines 445-448, authors suggested some post-processing calibration techniques, are they performed well over the focused region or other regions? Or are they widely used? Please add some references for them.

Response: We have modified one of the statements to indicate that we are recommending **testing** the suitability of IMERG Early for use in post-processing. We have also added the requested references. Some of these methods are basic (e.g., multiplicative bias correction) but some are cutting-edge (e.g, AI-based methods).