Thank you very much for resubmitting this very interesting manuscript and fully addressing my concerns. I think that including changes in land cover has greatly improved the manuscript. Well done! I have only one minor, rather technical comment. Other than that, I recommend this article for publication.

Minor comment:

- Lines: 348 – 351:

There it is written:
Furthermore, meteorological projections assume that air temperatures will increase overall. However, precipitation is expected to increase in the future as well (see Fig. S 1 and S 2 in the Supplement). Consequently, wetter conditions may have lowered future FFS, outweighing the effect of higher air temperatures and contributing to the lower mean FFS in future scenarios compared to the extremely hot and dry year of 2022.

I think here the wording regarding the wetter conditions is “too strong”. In Fig. S1 and S2 you are technically comparing different data sources (DWD data and GCM data). So I think that concluding only from Fig. S1 and S2 that future precipitation is expected to increase is too strong. For instance, it could be also that MPI-ESM-1-2-HR is generally overestimating precipitation in June in this region. So the increase in precipitation could be mostly an effect of a general bias in the GCM compared to the station data from DWD. Although it becomes clearer that there are larger uncertainties in future precipitation patterns later, I would avoid this general statement here. Maybe it could help to rewrite those sentences clearly saying that this (only) refers to the meteorological input data that you are using.