

Reply to reviewer

We would like to thank the reviewer for valuable suggestions and comments. In this document, **P** refers to the page number and **L** refers to the line number in the recent paper. For example, **P3L65-70**, refers to page 3, lines 65-70.

| Reviewer | | |
|----------|---|---|
| No | Comment | Reply |
| 1 | Deficit volume is expressed in m ³ but derived from average daily or monthly flow in m ³ sec ⁻¹ . Please provide the actual deficits volumes in m ³ or change the unit and explain how someone (e.g. a water manager) can calculate the actual volume of water missed. Another solution would be to transfer flow to mm / day and derive deficit volume from these time series. | We thank the reviewer for his/her remark. Indeed the reviewer is correct that we derive the deficit volume from average daily streamflow in m ³ s ⁻¹ . We changed the streamflow unit into m ³ d ⁻¹ for deficit volume calculation in the revised manuscript (table caption and text) (e.g. P10L323, P37 Table 1) and explained how to calculate the actual deficit volume in m ³ (P7L225-P8L227). |
| 2 | L16: „Earlier drought” -> could state earlier in the year as earlier could also refer to the considered period. | We revised the sentence into “...drought occurrences earlier than.....” (P1L16-17). |
| 3 | L45: “The standardized drought indices” -> could replace with “These standardized drought indices” as there are others (not mentioned ones). | We revised the text accordingly (P2L45). |
| 4 | Line 152-154: From this sentence, it is still not completely clear how you calculated the 12 monthly thresholds. | To make it clear, we divided the sentence into two parts. First part is dedicated for VTM (P5L151-152) and the second part is for VTD (P5L152-153). We also added explanation that we followed the M_MA method in Beyene et al. (2014) (P5L157). |
| 5 | Line 182: Suggest removing “widely selected”. | The words were deleted (P6L182). |
| 6 | Line 189: “was” -> “were” | We revised the word accordingly (P6L189). |
| 7 | Line 285: “somewhat lower”-> I would not call such a large decrease “somewhat lower” | The word “somewhat” was deleted (P9L286). |
| 8 | Line 310: “60% shorter” -> I think 40% shorter (60% of the original) | We thank the reviewer for careful reading and we changed the number into 40% (P10L311). |
| 9 | Line 320-329: Here, I would specifically mention differences in average river basin size among climates, as this might be a large contributor to differences in deficit volume. | The sentence was added in the revised manuscript (P11L330-331). |
| 10 | Line 525: Could start a new section here. | We decided to leave it as it is. |
| 11 | Line 532: “cause impacts” à replace with “might cause impacts” as this is particularly questionable in the high flow season. | We revised the sentence accordingly (P17L534). |
| 12 | Line 534: “or if observation record is short” -> do not agree. Why are monthly methods more suitable for short records compared to daily methods? | We revised the sentence and removed “or if observation record is short” (P17L535-536). |

Reference

Beyene, B. S., Van Loon, A. F., Van Lanen, H. A. J. & Torfs, P. J. J. F. Investigation of variable threshold level approaches for hydrological drought identification. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss.*, 11, 12765–12797, doi:10.5194/hessd-11-12765-2014, 2014.