**Editor Decision: Publish subject to minor revisions (Editor review)** (29 Apr 2016) by Dr. Jean-Philippe Vidal

Thank you for further feedback on how to improve the manuscript. Below please find a response to the open points.

- 1. There is still an inappropriate (following Referee #2 in the first-round review) "trigger" in the abstract L15
- → We think using "trigger" as verb in this context is acceptable. The reviewer wanted to clarify that we don't aim for designing triggers but thresholds that may serve as triggers in drought management plans.
- "Furthermore, thresholds are widely applied in these indicators but, to date, little empirical evidence exists as to which indicator thresholds trigger impacts on society, the economy, and ecosystems."
- 2. P7L11-12: Could you justify in a sentence the use of both near-natural and anthropogenically-influenced streamflow records? I point this out because this crucially may imply confusing recommendations for readers and users of streamflow records for evaluating drought impacts.
- $\rightarrow$  "The streamflow gauging stations in the UK and Germany encompass both near-natural and anthropogenically influenced streamflow records."  $\rightarrow$  In addition to this sentence we added:
- "Since different drought impacts may occur in near-natural and regulated rivers it is necessary to have an indicator reflecting the drought signal in both natural and managed systems."
- 3. P8L21-22 and Figure 2: There is an inconsistency of figures for the seasonal distribution of the number of impacts in the UK. The number "other types" of events seem largely overestimated with respect to both the regional split and the total figure given in the text. Please check this.
- $\rightarrow$  Thank you for noticing this. We had a wrong cell reference in the bar chart referring to I<sub>o</sub>. However, all in-text references to the numbers refer to the correct numbers and not to the ones displayed in Figure 2 (top right panel), which are incorrect for I<sub>o</sub>. We will provide a revised figure.
- 4. P9L7: How was the month of December treated when censoring the data considering that for seasonal analysis, the winter for a given year includes the preceding December (P8L20)? Please specify this.
- → All analyses were carried out using time series with monthly resolution. However, different subsets of periods for analysis were used. For the winter season we used the months D/J/F of all years of the censored time series per NUTS1 region in correct temporal sequence from one year to the next. We added further information to section 2.3 to clarify this.