General comments:

Thank you for making the changes. Here are some newer details that I have spotted. The minor comment is very minor, but the major comment may require some minor checking.

Major Comment:

Pg 12, lines 19-22: You could probably do some quick areal reduction factor (ARF) calculations to show how good is to assume high resolution gridded data can be compared with point data without correction. I do not know the ARF guidelines for US or Canada, but UK ARF guidelines (Kjeldsen 2007; see Chapter 4, free PDF is available at the referenced website) suggest with WRF, CMORPH and NSWEP grid at 39N (Washington DC) to have ARF ~ 0.9, 0.85, 0.8 respectively for 1hr precipitation. For 24h precipitation, ARF > 0.95. Of course, ARF themselves are approximations and region specific, but it is probably a good idea to comment on that how may affect your results. For example for your Fig 5, failure to account for areal averaging may push your MLAR curves downward; WRF's MLAR for 1h is negative about -0.08 (?); assuming UK ARF, log10(0.9) ~ -0.05, so your WRF results may actually look better than the plot indicates. Overall, your comment (Pg. 14, lines 23-24) that WRF is probably better than CMORPH in the representation of the current-climate rainfall extremes remains true (in fact WRF may be better than you think).

Minor Comment:

Equation 6: Define the meaning of U (uniform distribution) and N (normal distribution) and their bracketed parameters; some readers may not be familiar with that notation style.

Kjeldsen, T.R.. (2007). *The revitalised FSR/FEH rainfall-runoff method*. Centre for Ecology & Hydrology. Wallingford. Retrieved from https://www.ceh.ac.uk/services/flood-estimation-handbook