

1-3) Refer to PART I

4) Australia is a developed country. If I have misunderstood, do correct me. Therefore, I am expecting the authors to produce their own datasets to map Figure 1. There are too many sources/references cited to produce the map shown in Figure 1. This gives a bad impression about the state of water resources management in Australia. Since the spatial locations of raingages are available from the Bureau of Meteorology, it should be a matter of a few minutes to have the map of gages. Moreover, Australia has a fine resolution DEM. Therefore, producing the catchments and stream networks for the nation is not a pain-taking task. Are the authors lacking knowledge and experience?

5) In the current version of the manuscript, the thresholds that are used to remove unrealistically high hourly and daily rainfall data are not justified. What was the reason to set the daily threshold to 1500 mm/d? What was the reason to set the hourly threshold to 300 mm/h? Considering the authors' statements [LN 171-172, LN 106-107, LN 104] in the current version of the manuscript, these threshold values are not justified.

6) LN 170-Some unusually high values of hourly rainfall, mostly occurring at **midnight**, were detected. LN 168- The suspicious data were removed, including negative, ...

The authors have found some interesting points in the Australian datasets. It would be more appropriate to include a few lines to elaborate more on this for the readers to learn more on what has been found by the authors. What was the reason to have negative values in the dataset? What was the reason to have very high values of hourly rainfall, specifically at midnights? Are these observational errors, or are these due to some interesting unexplored researchable areas?

7) Refer to PART III