

I have appreciated the efforts made by authors to clarify my major comments.
I strongly suggest that a native English speaker revises the writing, the current version of the manuscript has several errors and does not flows well.

I have still some minor comments

Page 1

Line 27. Large part of Europe was ...

Line 27. Footprint. Maybe in the abstract would be better to use a more widely used terminology.

Line 28. I do not see the reason to mention in brackets “magnitude”, here and in the following lines of abstract. Consider to remove it.

Line 37. Diverging. I think it is not clear to what it is referring to.

Page 2

Line 13. Remove now, not needed

Line 30. I think “timely” is more appropriate than “thorough” in this context

Page 3

Line 24. “and are therefore spatially variable as well”. Consider to remove it, not needed.

Page 4

Line 28. with respect to their spatial coverage

Page 6

Line 2-4. You do not need to introduce the general formulation with n

Lines 7-10. Information not relevant, consider to remove it

Page 7

Line 8. Suggested instead of recommended.

Line 14. I suppose return period have been calculated by inversion of the fitting function. Plase clarify.

Line 28. Mixed mixture model... are you sure? Strange nomenclature

Line 29, Please, clarify for what event has been computed.

Page 9

Line 6. Please, introduce in methods how you identify winter low flows.

Line 17. Avoid the use of slightly, repetition

Line 22. Exceptional conditions. Not clear what you mean, please clarify.

Line 30 and following. This material should be mentioned in the method section.

Page 10

Line 2. Unclear, please clarify.

Page 11

Lines 23-26. Material for methods

Page 12

Line 12. While some regional features...

Line 20. The maps exhibit ... features. Please, consider to remove, not needed.

Line 24-25. Rephrase

Page 13

Lines 1-10. Please, clarify why you have performed this analysis and what are the main findings. Not clear at all. Furthermore, this mostly material for methods.

Line 4. Clarify to what correlations these numbers refer.

Lines 5-6. Counterintuitive result, please clarify.

Line 14. Please, add reference "droughts is one of the most costly hazards"

Page 14

Line 18. It is interesting to analyse? Let the reader think if it is interesting or not.

Page 16. I still think that the paper would benefit if this part would be removed completely. This is not related to your findings, It does not add any relevant information.

Line 33. Personal communications by who?? Please, use appropriate references.

Page 23. First two references are reported wrongly.

Figure 2. It would be useful to see the number of stations used for the boxplots

Figure 3. Add color palette

Figure 6 and 7. Panel a and b are redundant, please remove them. In panels c-h, use larger dots.

For the reference stations of altschaining use a different type of line, is confounded with the $y=0$ line. I suppose that each gray line is a station in panels i-n. Please clarify in captions.

Figure 10. Explain the meaning of seasonality in caption. Change colour for potentially ongoing (not extreme) and potentially ongoing (most extreme) to improve visual distinction.

Table A1-A3. I suppose that numbers refer to return period. Please clarify in caption. Bars on the right are redundant and do not add relevant information, please consider to remove them.