

Response to Reviewer #2 comments

In this study, three models were implemented to conduct watershed simulation in India. The amazing thing is that the whole India was included, however, quite a few modeling details were missing. Therefore, I probably cannot proceed detailed review at this point. I would suggest adding those details as supplementary information in the next round. On the other hand, there are other similar work done by using multiple models (not limited: Scavia et al. (2017) Sharifi et al. (2017)). You did not mention the advantages/disadvantages by using multiple models (and, why these three models??). It cannot always only for the good reasons right? Overall, the content of the given manuscript is way less than it should be (in all sections). Good luck in the next round.

- Scavia, D., M. Kalcic, R. L. Muenich, J. Read, N. Aloysius, I. Bertani, C. Boles, R. Confessor, J. DePinto, M. Gildow, J. Martin, T. Redder, S. Sowa, Y. Wang, H. Yen, 2017. Multiple SWAT models guide strategies for agricultural nutrient reductions. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 15(3), pp. 126-132.

- Sharifi, A., H. Yen, K. M. B. Boomer, L. Kalin, X. Li, D. E. Weller, 2017. Using multiple watershed models to assess the water quality impacts of alternate land development scenarios for a small community. *Catena*, 150C, pp. 87-99.

We thank the reviewer for his/her insightful comments. We will take care of the suggested references in the revised manuscript. By using the multiple models, we aim to represent the (model) uncertainty in soil-moisture drought simulations across India. We will enhance the discussion part of the revised manuscript to make it clear about advantages and limitations of using the multiple models. Moreover, we provide more details on the land surface models in the supplemental section of the revised manuscript.