

Dear Dr. Peres,

Thank you for the suggestions and for the review process of our manuscript.

Regarding the suggested detailed analysis we have some points:

**1. Probability distribution goodness of fit tests.**

We did compute the SPI and SPEI by applying different distributions, but we did not want to make this discussion in the manuscript, mainly because such a discussion usually is the topic of a whole manuscript. Since we did not find any significant changes when using different distributions, we proceeded with the manuscript by using the well-known distributions: Gamma for SPI and log-logistic for SPEI. The correlation coefficients between the SPI/SPEI indices based on different distributions varies between 0.98 and 0.99, thus we are 100% that our choice is suitable for the current study. We added the correlation coefficients in the revised version of the manuscript, but we have decided not to add any additional figures, mainly because the paper is already very long and we have already 25 figures (main + supplementary).

**2. Threshold for defining events.**

To comply with the requirements from the reviewers and the editor we have added in the supplementary file 2 extra figures (Figure S10 and S11) in which we perform the same analysis as in Figure 8, but by using different thresholds for the computation of the joint occurrence of warm and dry events.

We hope that we were able to comply with the suggestions from the editor and that our manuscript is now suitable for publications.

Best wishes,

Monica Ionita