

Many thanks to the author for considering my comments and for the effort in the responses. I really appreciate the additional analyses and figures in the papers and supplementary information.

I have two minor comments for the authors that relate to my original review and need further discussion in the paper:

1. Model performance metrics

Thanks for the additional detail in the supplementary material and text in the methods. However, the justification for the choice of metrics still needs improving. In the paper, it is stated that *'The metrics selected are unweighted as high flows (NSE), timing of flows (logNSE), flow variability (MAPE) and overall water balance (PBIAS) should be considered equally important for river flows during the driest years.'* However, there is still no discussion (as far as I can tell) of **why** they should be considered important and **why** they should be considered equally important. Why are high flows important to consider when analysing future storylines of drought?

2. Delta change approach

I still feel that there is a lack of critical discussion related to the delta change approach in the limitations section. While I appreciate the additional text on alternative methods, there is only one sentence (as far as I can tell – apologies if I have missed this) on the limitations of a delta change approach: *'By not considering changes in the likelihood of such an event, it could under- or over-estimate drought impacts from climate change.'* There needs to be more critical discussion of this approach and its ability to capture how droughts might unfold in the future.