

Review:

This revision addresses all my earlier comments well. My major concerns and comments were addressed and changed. However, some minor comments are listed below.

Minor Comments:

P3: All paragraphs start with "This analysis..." or "Analysis of...", which is not very elegant.
Suggestion: L23: "Another study of drought projections on a continental scale was carried out by Bleckinsop and Fowler (2007). In this paper six climate models..." L30: "Orlowsky and Seneviratne (2013) presented an investigation on future SPI12 characteristics, again on a continental scale."

P4, L4: "Meteorological drought was estimated using the SPI at..."

P4, L7-9: Delete sentence: "The analysis of change..." It is not relevant at that section.

P10, L5: "was one of the major aims of this work."

P10, L15-17: Some general comment: I don't see the problem in the SPI ranging at values beyond [-3,+3]. If you have a change in precipitation in the future and you compare it to present day climate, then you might reach more extreme values of the SPI (either dry or wet). The uncertainties are growing of course, moving towards the tails of the distribution. But there is no justification to say that an SPI must not be below -3 or above +3, since a unit normal distribution does not stop at these values.

Please reconsider your formulations.

P21, L2: delete "as a measure of goodness of fit."

P22, L9-10: "and considerable inter-model variability"

P22, L13: "showing considerable differences between climate model simulations."

P22, L13-14: "In general, our study also confirms the results..."

P22, L18: "Our results indicate that the..."

P22, L25: "We also noticed that..."