

thank you for your revised version and for the exhausting answers to the Reviewers. I found those, and the changes applied to the original version of the manuscript, very pertinent.

I consider the current almost ready to be accepted, but I would like the Authors to slightly improve Sect.2.3 which I still found a bit unclear.

If you wish, please use a simple illustration to describe the different datasets. However please do consider expanding a bit on the reasons behind the choice of "I" and of the radar observations positions.

Thank you for the positive feedback. We have included a schematic of the generation of the data sets (see below). We also included an explanation of why we use  $I_t$ :

*"We include this information because we know from Ruckstuhl and Janjic (2018) that the strength of the QPEs lies in suppressing spurious convection. Since the radar observations cover only rainy regions, the data set  $I_t$  can help the CNN to distinguish between dry and rainy regions and possibly develop a different regime for each situation. We verified that the CNN yields significantly different output when setting all values of  $I_t$  to zero, indicating that the CNN indeed uses this information. We are open to more suggestions on how to clarify!"*

