

We thank the reviewers for reading our revised manuscript and appreciate the comments. Below we address both reviewers' comments in detail. Line numbers refer to clean version of the manuscript (with line numbers from reviewers' comments in brackets).

### **Reviewer 1:**

Since PET is a notional variable, different definitions can be found in the literature. The concepts of  $ET_0$ , PET and atmospheric demand are frequently used interchangeably as noted by the reviewer. In this study we computed  $ET_0$  via the Penman-Monteith equation using a reference crop surface and meteorological data from the weather stations. Then  $ET_0$  was used to calculate AET.

We acknowledge the confusion and have changed all references of PET to  $ET_0$  in the manuscript.

Within the model actual crop evapotranspiration under unstressed conditions is estimated as:  $AET = k_c * ET_0$ , while under stressed conditions AET is reduced by the coefficient  $k_s$ , which is calculated within the model and related to water availability. We believe that it is important to keep Eq. 3 in the manuscript, but we refer to AET rather than PET, which supports a fuller explanation of the estimation of  $k_c$ . We also updated the link in the reference list.

**Fig. 6c:** Added correlation coefficient ( $R^2$ ) to the graph.

**Eq. 4:** Changed regression coefficients to  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ .

### **Reviewer 2:**

**L103 (L228):** Sentence was changed according to suggestion from the reviewer.

**Fig 1:** Added photos of the two study sites.

**L164 (L380):** The suggested corrections were made.

**L186 (L404):** The suggested correction was made.

**L193 (L409):** The sentence was edited.

**L196 (L413):** We clarified our approach of removal of cloudy images in the text.

**L210 (L415):** The suggested changes were made.

**L237 (L460):** Suggested sentence was removed.

**L330 - Sect.3.1** Renamed to "Climatology of the Drought".

**L 333 (L685):** The suggested changes were made.

**Fig 6:** Added legend to Fig. 6d,e to reduce ambiguity of the plotted NDVI of the different drought periods. Because the statistical difference is not easily visible in the violin plot for the inland site, we denoted any significance with \*\*\* in the plot.