

Dear Editor,

We sincerely thank you for the careful and constructive assessment of our revised manuscript. We greatly appreciate all efforts that have contributed to the improvement of our submission through different rounds of revision.

We are grateful for the opportunity to further improve the manuscript and hope that the revised version satisfactorily addresses your technical concerns.

Sincerely,

Ahmed Kenawy

On behalf of all coauthors

Comment:

I have just one minor technical request before then. As the Supplement is an important component of the paper—addressing several points raised during the review process and providing valuable additional information on the uncertainties and rationale underlying your workflow—could you please ensure that its presentation is as consistent as possible throughout? For example, the styling of Figs. S3 and S4 currently differs somewhat. It would be greatly appreciated if consistent fonts and figure formatting could be used across all supplementary figures. In addition, please check that all captions and labels are clearly legible; in particular, the text in Fig. S5 appears rather small.

Thanks for this helpful suggestion. We revised the Supplementary Material to improve consistency and legibility across Figs. S1–S5. In particular, Figs. S3 and S4 were harmonized in terms of font size, panel lettering, axis formatting, line weights, spacing, and overall layout. Figure S3 was also reformatted to clearly distinguish hydrological versus agricultural impact reporting and severe versus extreme drought conditions, and its caption was revised accordingly.

Figure S5 was substantially revised to improve readability, including larger titles, axis labels, tick labels, legends, and color-bar annotations, together with consistent panel labels (a–f). We also checked all Supplementary captions and labels for consistency and legibility.