

The revised manuscript entitled “Coastal and orographic effects on extreme precipitation revealed by weather radar observations” has been improved. Most of the comments and questions were fully responded in detail. This study is high-quality for the publication in HESS. Nevertheless, several remaining and new questions still exist and are listed as follows:

- (1) I don't think a statement of FSE and/or a citation of it would take much space in the text, since this definition, which was used throughout the result, is basic and important for the method.
- (2) Please mind the line numbers in your reply should refer to the revised manuscript.
- (3) The word of “framework” was used in Method Section for many times, for examples, in Lines 168, 169 and 228. However, sometimes the so-called “framework” was just a statistical distribution or a simple utility.
- (4) Some subscripts of the variables were italic, while some are not (see Lines 235 and 245). Please correct them throughout the manuscript.
- (5) In supplement, the color change trend in FSE legend of Fig. S1a (dark colors denote large values) is inconsistent with that in BIAS legend of Fig. S1b (light colors denote large values). Furthermore, this trend in FSE legend of Fig. S3 changes again.
- (6) The  $\lambda$  scale parameter in Fig. S4a, d, g has a unit of mm/h. Why a distribution parameter has precipitation intensity unit. Please clarify its physical meaning.
- (7) In Fig. 5a, for the shape parameter as a function of terrain elevation for durations of 10 minutes, the weather radar data derived a slightly decreasing regression line (in solid black), whereas the rain gauge data derived a slightly increasing one (in dashed grey). It can be observed from the first two dots at 10' in Fig. 5 also. What results in this discrepancy, the radar errors or the bias correct uncertainty?
- (8) Thanks for the authors' reply to my Comment 4 about the storm definition. For the radar pixels on the sea (I mean the regions where there are no rain gauges, see the Fig. S2), what station data or which rain gauges were referred when the storm events of radar precipitation were extracted?
- (9) The Section 6 Summary and Conclusion should be more concise and without citations, since detailed analysis has been provided in the Section 5 Discussion.

(10) In Line 618, I believe the authors made a mistake by writing “standard errors in the order of ~22%,” when revising the manuscript. Please recheck all the updated numerical values after every revision.