

Point by Point Response for Reviewer 1

General Comment:

The revised manuscript is still very well written. The comments to improve slightly the structure and the presentation of the methodology have been very well addressed. The authors gave relevant responses to each comment and improved a few sections of the article accordingly. The downscaling method used to select the climate model ensembles and the valorisation of the climate outputs to study the drought indices are well explained and a lot clearer than in the previous version. I believe this paper well addresses its research question, with now a clear methodology and comprehensive analyses of the future characteristics of drought in Australia and recommend it for publication.

Response:

Thank you for the time spent reviewing the article and for your constructive comments which have improved the manuscript.

Specific Comment:

L179 and 185: Some « SPI/SPEI » left.

Response:

We have fixed these two instances to 'SPI or SPEI' as suggested.

Specific Comment:

L85-86: Issue in the sentence: "The downscaling was performed using dynamically downscaled using the Conformal Cubic Atmospheric Model (CCAM)"

Response:

We have fixed this sentence to:

'The downscaling was performed using the Conformal Cubic Atmospheric Model (CCAM).'