

Dear authors,

Thanks a lot for your detailed response. Over two rounds of revisions, the methods have become a lot clearer, the results got much more complete, and the discussion improved (I much like the added paragraphs at the end). I have one comment and only few minor suggestions remaining, which the authors could consider implementing.

Comment:

Deficit volume is expressed in m^3 but derived from average daily or monthly flow in $m^3 \text{ sec}^{-1}$. 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.

Minor suggestions:

- L16: „Earlier drought“ → could state earlier in the year as earlier could also refer to the considered period.
- L45: “The standardized drought indices” → could replace with “These standardized drought indices” as there are others (not mentioned ones).
- Line 152-154: From this sentence, it is still not completely clear how you calculated the 12 monthly thresholds.
- Line 182: Suggest removing “widely selected”.
- Line 189: “was” → “were”
- Line 285: “somewhat lower” → I would not call such a large decrease “somewhat lower”
- Line 310: “60% shorter” → I think 40% shorter (60% of the original)
- 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.
- Line 525: Could start a new section here.
- Line 532: “cause impacts” → replace with “might cause impacts” as this is particularly questionable in the high flow season.
- Line 534: “or if observation record is short” → do not agree. Why are monthly methods more suitable for short records compared to daily methods?