

Response to Review

Comment	Answer, changes
Reviewer 1	
The results and discussion should be two independent sections. The research questions should be revisited in the discussion explicitly, with answers.	Agreed, section added and questions are addressed
Reviewer 2	
The manuscript "Seasonal forecasting of local-scale soil moisture droughts with Global BROOK90: A case study of the European drought of 2018" by Vorobeuskii et al. has significantly improved. It is apparent that the authors have put significant effort to address all comments from the reviewers and provide a much-improved manuscript. Reviewing the manuscript, I am overall satisfied with the quality of text, arguments and scientific content provided. My comments are minor (provided in the attached PDF file), which only target to polish the manuscript. Hence, I am happy to accept the article after the corrections.	Agreed, corrected
Editors	
We propose publishing subject to minor revisions, whereby reviewer 1 has a referee report with a few minor comments meant to polish the manuscript. Reviewer 2 requires to, first of all, clearly separate the results and the discussion. Results are simply reporting of the findings and Discussion evaluates these results in the context of the research questions. Secondly, whilst the research questions are useful to motivate the paper, they do not appear to be explicitly revisited later. This would be useful (and a good way to structure a distinct Discussion section). i.e. Provide clear answers to those questions. On the topic of research questions the first question is also a little problematic: "Can a local-scaled soil moisture forecast be achieved from a global setup based on open-sourced data and a 1D water balance model?" This is simply stating the aim of the work in the form of a question and is unscientific. If it were a scientific question then we might expect the results to provide evidence supporting an answer either of "yes" or "no". In this case, if the answer was "no", there would be no paper. As such, we recommend removing this question.	Agreed, added and corrected