

## ***Interactive comment on “Vegetation vulnerability to drought on southeastern Europe” by Patrícia Páscoa et al.***

**Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 30 June 2018

The title of the manuscript is a mistake, since the content does not refer to other territory than Romania. Eastern Europe holds a very diverse geography, so that doing a study on Romania and pretending it is about Eastern Europe is huge mistake. Such a market strategy is used to attract public and citations, but it is not a fair approach.

Lines 185-190: "Negative correlations are more frequently found on the months of May and June" - can you explain why the correlations are more frequent in May and June? The same amendments would be nice for the next paragraphs, as they are mostly descriptive and not enough explanations are provided. Why no correlation in June for "the area south of the Carpathian Mountains" (L194) and "The areas showing positive correlations from April to June are mostly agricultural land" (L197), so including the areas south of the Carpathians?

C1

Lines 214-219: as mentioned before, the explanations are almost missing, while the very simple description fills the lines. For example, why the standard deviation is lower until July in some forests?

The section 3.3 is a very poor description of the drought event 2000/2001, with no explanation and no positioning in the general context of the droughts in Romania, not to say SE Europe as pretended in the title. The authors claims that "In this section we assess the impact of the strong drought episode of 2000/2001". In reality, the impact has been mentioned very poorly mentioned in the section. This is valid with section 4 too, where the authors claim again that "impacts of droughts on vegetation were analysed". The drought impact is actually indirectly tackled in this paper in the form of the well-known relations between SPEI and NDVI.

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2018-264>, 2018.

C2