

*The paper introduces the reconstruction of spatio-temporal distribution of rainfall (I would prefer to say water availability) anomalies of the period of 1650-1976 using treering chronology and spatio-temporal statistics. The results are very interesting and scientifically relevant in our times, when climate variations (change?) are of ample interest in hydrology and water management. Extending time series of climate variables beyond the instrumental time series helps the understanding of the processes.*

*The applied methodology is sound: Based on detailed field sampling, 17 sets of tree cores were collected, and the data set was extended from Tree-Ring Data Bank by another 5 sets. Since dendrology lies very far from my field of expertise, I would not dare to judge this part of the methodology.*

*Advanced statistical methods were used to create representative tree-ring chronologies for the 22 sites, correlate the tree-ring widths with measured rainfall depths and to reconstruct the spatio-temporal variability of the rainfall.*

ANSWER: I thank the Referee for the complimentary remarks.

*Nevertheless, I would prefer to use the term water availability instead of rainfall, since the tree rings are related to the water taken up by the plant and not the rainfall directly, although the rainfall is the most important but not the only factor in it.*

ANSWER: The following sentence was added in the revised version of the manuscript to address the Referee's comment:

*"Even though tree growth depends on water uptake by the roots, and not directly on precipitation, long-term instrumental observations are not available to calibrate tree-ring chronologies against soil-level processes."*

*The methods are reasonably well explained. The title describes the topic properly, and the structure of the article is logical. But we have to admit that it is not easy to read the article: the text is very complex, especially in the discussion part. Long sentences (5-7lines) with several brackets and references make the reader's life difficult.*

ANSWER: The text was revised, wherever possible, to improve its readability.

*We cannot agree enough with the statement on Lines 7-8 on page 4315: "Information derived from the past, such as the tree-ring reconstructions I presented, requires careful consideration." As the Author points out, the applied statistical methods are based on certain assumptions, like linearity and stationarity (and I would add isotropy), which is not necessarily the case of weather and climatic processes. Compared to the scale of the latter, the studied area is relatively small and this is the reason why no really clear overall spatial patterns could be identified in the interpolation results. Thus, in my view, the effort of spatial analysis did not really pay off in this case. Nevertheless, the introduced methods can be used on data with a larger spatial spread.*

ANSWER: This article can be viewed as an initial effort aimed at testing the applicability of space-time kriging for producing km-scale proxy records of climate. It is expected that a larger area will be studied in the near future as a further extension of the work.

*Stating that the “Multi-century long dendroclimatic records with km-scale spatial resolution are therefore essential tools for designing management practices with the objective to achieve drought resiliency in individual watersheds” is a bit enthusiastic, but we can agree that these records help in understanding (spatio-)temporal patterns of hydro-climatic variables, and this leads to the design of better climate scenarios.*

ANSWER: In the Conclusion section, which was added in the revised version of the manuscript, the word “essential” was replaced with “useful” to follow the Referee’s suggestion.

*A few specific suggestion:*

*Breaking up long sentences into shorter and grammatically simpler ones would increase the understandability of the text.*

ANSWER: The text was revised according to the Referee’s suggestion.

*Fig. 3 – too small characters on the axes.*

ANSWER: The font size of all labels was increased.

*Fig. 4 – too small characters and messy appearance.*

ANSWER: The font size of all labels was increased.

The Referee’s contribution was acknowledged in the revised version of the manuscript.