Authors proposed RN-Net for a rainfall nowcasting. Reviewer has some concerns about comparison and discussion of the numerical example, and the data used in the manuscripts.

1. Authors wrote RN-Net superior to other DNN models and WRF, but this claim is not supported by the numerical examples.

1.1 Some NWP models are designed so that it likely to outputs more rain than actual rainfall since it is used for mitigation. If WRF is one of such models, authors should explain it and inform readers. Moreover, Please clarify the forecast time horizon. If WRF horizon is 12 hours issued every 6 hours, the comparison between DNN and WRF is not fare. Please also check comment #14.

1.2 Indeed RN-Net outperforms WRF, other deep learning models also outperform WRF. It is miss-reading if authors write "RN-Net outperforms WRF." It should be "DNN outperforms WRF"

1.3 The difference between RE-RF-ConvLSTM and RN-Net looks small. Moreover, MSE, MAE, and FAR of RE-RF-ConvLSTM is smaller than RN-Net. For reviewer, it is not trivial if RN-Net is the best. Authors have to carefully describe the difference between them before claiming RN-Net is the best.

2. What is the type of the rain gauge? If it is the tipping bucket type, measurement is discrete; for example, the bucket turns over every 0.5mm rainfall, and it cannot measure 0.25mm rainfall. Then, why did authors choose 0.25mm as the threshold in Tables 3 to 7? At first, authors should explain the mechanism of the rain gauge, and should justify 0.25mm, 1mm, 2.5mm in Tables 3 to 7.

3. P.3, L.104: Author wrote that n is set to 16, but how authors choose 16 weather station? Did authors choose nearest 16 points? It should be clarified.

4. Line 118: Temporal discretization of RE and RF looks different. For RF, authors wrote temporal step is 30 minutes, but how about RE? it should be clarified.

5. Line 139 and 141: Authors wrote "echo data / rainfall data RE/RF", but the symbol is miss-reading since it implies division. Authors should use "and" for clarity of writing.

6. Equation (5) and (6): Authors wrote "RE minus Encoder([RE]_t)". Symbols RE and [RE]_t looks different, but RE is not defined. Please define every symbols.

7. L. 186-188: Authors wrote "The original radar echo data is converted to pixel data", but in section 2.1, authors wrote the original data is filtered. Please clarify.

8. L. 186-188: How does radar echo intensity converted to input data? Is the data normalized or standardized? It should be clarified.

9. L. 192: Authors wrote "The original (rainfall) data is converted", but in section 2.1, authors wrote the original data is interpolated. Please clarify.

10. L. 192: How does rainfall data converted to input data? Is it normalized or standardized? If yes, reviewer imagine the rainfall measurement includes small cases of huge precipitation (e.g. a localized torrential downpour). Such a phenomenon may affect the standardization. This is not mandatory, but if authors explain the methodology, it will be a good suggestion for readers.

11. L.193: Authors wrote the dataset is divided into training, validation, and test data. What does validation data is used for? The hyperparameters are given a priori in Table 2. Are hyperparameters decided using validation data? If so, please clarify.

12. L.239: Authors wrote "2-hour data every 0.5 hours from the 12 hours", and "there are 21 sets of data in total". At t=0, WRF predicts t=0 to 12, and at the next time step, WRF issue prediction at t=6 that contains prediction of t=6-18. Then, authors have two sets (issued at t=0 and t=6) of prediction for t=6-12. Which data does authors use? Please clarify.

13. Authors wrote WRF is issued every 6 hours. Does it mean when authors compare DNN and WRF, the time of issue is different? For example, even if DNN predicts rainfall at t=0, the time of issue of WRF can be t=-5.5hous? Please clarify.

14. If authors use WRF result at every 6 hours, the comparison between DNN and WRF is not fare since time horizon is different. Please clarify and justify this point. The following idea is just a comment and not mandatory for revision, but the reviewer recommend to separate the claim in the manuscript as 1. DNN model can issue prediction every 30 minutes, whereas WRF cannot, and 2. comparison between WRF of forecast horizon 2-hour and DNN.

15. Line 286: Authors claim that RN-Net outperforms other DNN models, but this topic is not discussed in the main sentences. Please discuss in the main body.