

We thank the reviewer for providing feedback to improve our manuscript. Below we provide a point-by-point response to the minor comments.

Standardize and refine the formatting of all tables to ensure consistency, including the format of table titles.

We have now reformatted all tables to maintain consistency. This includes shortening and standardizing table titles, removing colour, and applying a uniform layout across all tables.

The first three paragraphs of the Introduction mainly describe drought events in Belgium and their associated impacts. While the background and motivation of the study are important, this part appears somewhat lengthy and occupies a relatively large proportion of the Introduction. It may be worth considering streamlining this section to improve the overall balance and conciseness of the manuscript.

We have now condensed the narrative of the drought events in Belgium to a maximum of one paragraph. We have retained only text that provides context to the reader.

While the authors discuss the limitations of precipitation-based indices for representing agricultural drought, it would improve clarity to briefly define meteorological, agricultural, and hydrological drought in the Introduction. Since these three types of drought are mentioned in the manuscript, a short clarification of their differences would help readers better understand the context.

We agree. We have now added definitions of meteorological, agricultural, and hydrological drought to the Introduction to clarify the distinction between these drought types.

4. The first part of the Discussion appears somewhat lengthy and contains a substantial amount of background information. Streamlining this section and focusing more directly on the interpretation of the study's findings would improve the clarity and readability of the manuscript.

In the revised manuscript we have shortened this section and retained only the broader European context needed to situate the results.

Lines 525–535: The manuscript notes that the results are consistent with the intensification of droughts across Europe in the 21st century and then lists several individual studies in detail. It may not be necessary to describe each study separately in the text. If the authors wish to retain these references,

presenting them in a concise summary (e.g., a table or a shorter synthesis) could make the information more accessible while reducing the textual burden.

We agree. We have replaced the study-by-study discussion with a shorter synthesis that retains the key references while reducing the textual burden.

Lines 540–558: This section discusses large-scale atmospheric circulation patterns and anthropogenic warming as drivers of drought dynamics. While this information is relevant in a broader context, its direct connection to the results of this study appears somewhat limited. The authors may consider shortening this part or relocating some of the background discussion to the Introduction to maintain a clearer focus in the Discussion section.

We have also shortened this section and reframed so that it provides only the broader physical context needed to interpret the recent sequence of severe droughts identified in Belgium.

With these revisions, we believe that the revised manuscript addresses all the comments raised.