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We thank Referee #2 for the time and effort spent on reviewing our manuscript and the constructive and specific comments given. In the following we will respond to the six points raised by the referee.

1. As also indicated in our response to Referee #1 (AC C3075), we agree that our article can be extended beyond a listing of the indicators. We will add to our review more reflection on the indicator classes and the rationale behind them. Specifically, we will discuss per category of indicators (where not already done so): which insights are they able to provide and which not; for which purposes are they useful (rationale behind development); which processes, both natural and human, are of influence on the indicators. This implies that we will transform our writing to a more discussive style where appropriate, as recommended by Referee #2.

2. We very much appreciate the suggestion to include an overview table of the indicator classes in the paper. We will include such a table, including a characterization of each class based on the specific points from our more comprehensive review (see point 1).

3. In accordance with the referee’s proposition we will include the following sentences in the introduction of the paper: “A review of green water scarcity indicators is new in its kind. Past reviews of water scarcity indicators (Savenije, 2000; Rijsberman, 2006) date back a while and hence do not include recent developments in the field, especially those related to the inclusion of green water. There exist multiple reviews of specific green water availability indicators, such as indicators of aridity (Wallén, 1967; Walton, 1969; Stadler, 2005) and drought (World Meteorological Organization, 1975; Ville and Glantz, 1985; Maracchi, 2000; Tate and Gustard, 2000; Keyantash and Dracup, 2002; Heim, 2002; Hayes, 2007; Kallis, 2008; Mishra and Singh, 2010; Sivakumar et al., 2010). We classify and discuss these indicators in an overarching way.” This addition will make two other sentences in the paper superfluous, which will therefore be removed (p.5529, lines 8-9; p.5532, lines 5-7).

4. As indicated in our response to Referee #1, we agree that the prevalence of multiple definitions is interesting to discuss in the paper. We will include a discussion of these alternative definitions in Section 2.3. We focus therein on the various definitions of green water. We think this focus is appropriate, because definitions of blue water are more or less comparable and an elaborate discussion on blue water does not fit the purpose of the paper.

5. We will carefully check the text once more.

6. In fact, the paper already mentions that the study by Gerten et al. (2011) (and also those by Rockström et al. (2009) and Kummu et al. (2014)) includes blue water in their combined green-blue water scarcity indicators. However, we will note this more
explicitly. The green water scarcity indicator by Hoekstra et al. (2011) does not include blue water (as mentioned in the paper). We will include a discussion in Section 3.2 on why the aforementioned authors have chosen to include blue water in their assessments (and what are the benefits of that) and why an accurate indicator of green water scarcity can better omit blue water.
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