Dear Authors,

The referees have raised several issues about your manuscript, which you have generally addressed in your replies in a satisfactory manner. Please change your manuscript accordingly before resubmission and provide two versions of the revised manuscript: One with, one without track changes indicated.

Some additional comments from my side:

- I agree with the referees that the manuscript needs more focus, which you have indicated to put on the definition and application of the three indices. This is good, but if you do so, you should also, as proposed by the referees, provide an identification of extreme rainfall and flood events based on established 'benchmark' approaches, and compare the so-found rainfall and flood extremes in the manner you do for your indices. This should help to clarify the Pros and Cons of your approach and help readers to decide when to apply you approach (and when not).
- Page 292, line 13 pp: Like referee #1, I also had a hard time to understand the method from your explanation, even the revised one. Please rework this section again.
- Page 293, line 14-15 (comment by referee #1): I think your answer has not sufficiently addressed the question of referee #1. I think he asked what conclusions i) about the agreement of rainfall and flood extremes in general and ii) about the applicability of your indices to identify them can be drawn from e.g. a 75% overlap of rainfall and flood extremes, and why.
- Referee #2 raises the issue of how the use of human-influenced flood hydrographs compromises the results and conclusions of your study. This is an important issue, which you have addressed in your reply. While I agree that you cannot avoid using such data (as there are not too many uninfluenced rivers left), you need to go into more detail here and give proof that the use of these data does not significantly alter the results of your study. E.g. estimate what the degree of uncertainty of the flood recurrence intervals induced by human inference is and how much this alters the FEI's and the comparison of WEI's and FEI's. As cited by you, Buchtele (1972) states that human influence becomes negligible for larger-than-20-year-floods. However, in your study you work with 50 events selected from 50 years (Sect. 3.1), which clearly includes less rare events.
- When comparing the FEI and WEI values in Section 2.4, it is not clear to me whether the ranges of values that WEI, WAI and FEI can attain are identical or just comparable. If the latter is the case (which I think), I suggest not taking the ratio of the values, but compare the ranks of FEI and WEI from identical periods of time instead (e.g. take the difference of the ranks). A higher rank of FEI than WEI of a particular event then indicates an event that is more extreme wrt flood than rainfall.
- A final suggestion for further studies, which you already may have thought of: Quantify the extremity of antecedent conditions in the same manner as WEI and FEI. This gives you, in the framework you have built, additional possibilities to analyze the causes and propagation of 'extremity' of events.

Yours sincerely,

Uwe Ehret