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The authors describe a precipitation data set obtained during the APRES3 campaign in Antarctica. Given the lack of precipitation measurement in Antarctica, the data set is highly relevant and I strongly appreciate that the authors share this unique data set. In general, I recommend the paper for publication subject to the following minor comments.

General: The files provided do not have a common format. With libraries such as xarray and pandas, it is actually very easy to provide consistent CSV files or even netCDFs. I would appreciate if the authors would provide at least reading routines.

Errors: I understand that a precise uncertainty estimation is not possible for every variable, but at least add (or point to) a discussion of uncertainties for every data set.
MASC data set: unit of fall speed is missing

L12: is -> was (?)

L 26f: ‘poor cousin’, L 43: ‘can simply not done’, L 74 “run into problems”: too colloquial
L 45f: I would recommend: "However, strong katabatic winds are frequently blowing at the peripheries."
L 50: re-mobilized
L 103: masterpieces -> the core instruments
L 101: Please add information about the scan strategy of the X-band radar. What range resolution was used for the MRR and the X-band?
L 106: Add that it is a pulsed radar in contrast to the FMCW.
L 117: What is the attenuation of the radome?
L 151: The reason why the lowest two bins have to be removed is not related to ground clutter, they are also too noisy.
L 152: I would recommend: “Precipitation rates were retrieved from MRR data following Grazzioli et al”. Further, I would recommend to summarize the retrieval technique in one sentence.
L155: ‘standard correction method’ for what? Wind?

L255: Remove ‘data availability’