We appreciate the reviewer for the genuine and frank comments on our manuscript, which has boosted our confidence in our research. Our point-by-point responses are as followed, divided into responses to specific comments and responses to technical comments.

Responses to specific comments:

We sincerely thank the reviewer for helping us explore the modern meaning of historical case studies. We will add a discussion, section 4.2, to analyze the inheritance of historical disaster response in modern China.

The disaster response measures and ideas in the past have a profound influence on modern-day disaster management in China. For example, the **process of disaster management in modern time** consists of three phases: pre-disaster prevention, emergency, and post-disaster reconstruction and restoration (Patel & Hastak, 2013; Safapour et al., 2021), which is similar to the idea of famine preparedness and famine relief in ancient China. To mitigate famine and ensure food security, contemporary China still pays more attention to **similar famine mitigation measures about food production and food reserve** (Bruins & Bu, 2006), such as the construction and maintenance of water conservancy projects, crop improvement, and policies to protect arable land from being encroached upon by urban development. Regarding **leadership** in disaster management, the government always plays a central role. As for **disaster culture**, the collectivist spirit of "Support from all sides when one side is in trouble" remains a guiding principle. Therefore, we will add a discussion section to explore the impact of historical response experiences on contemporary disaster management.

Responses to technical comments:

We sincerely appreciate the reviewer's technical comments, which have enhanced the rigor of our manuscript and ensured consistency in formatting.

Firstly, after examing the discussion of American crops, we found their impact on the Wanli drought was overestimated. As a result, we will remove the discussion related to American crops.

Secondly, in Table 4 and Table 6, the term "AD1" is used to represent different meanings (as indicated by the formulas below). Using the same notation in both cases may lead to confusion. We will adopt distinct symbols to clearly differentiate them.

In Table 4, AD1 represents the average drought severity of two drought events under the Type C, calculated using the following formula:

$$AD = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{4} d \Big/ 4 \times N$$

AD represents the average drought grade; 4 refers to the four-year duration of the two drought events; *i* is the *i*-th year of the drought; *n* is the *n*-th drought-affected country. *N* is the total number of drought-affected counties under the Type C.

In Table 6, AD1 represents the average drought severity of two drought events under the Type A and Type B calculated using the following formula:

$$AD' = \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{i=1}^{4} d \Big/ 4 \times N'$$

AD' represents the average drought grade; 4 refers to the four-year duration of the two drought events; *i* is the *i*-th year of the drought; *n* is the *n*-th drought-affected country. *N* is the total number of drought-affected counties under the Type A and Type B.

Thirdly, we will review the reference formatting in the manuscript and make corrections to any citations with formatting errors.

Thank you very much for the reviewer's suggestions. We noticed that the same set of comments was uploaded four times. To avoid unnecessary messages, we have responded to just one. We appreciate your understanding.