
This work investigates the effect of low-frequency variability on low and high groundwater levels extremes measured in the Paris basin. To my understanding, all methods have been applied correctly and lead to results which allow a thorough analysis of the "low-frequency variability induced extremes".

I have some minor questions and remarks.

L11 - At first reading it is not very clear what is meant by "sensitive". Maybe use "low GWLs are stemming/resulting from such low-frequency..".

L16 - consisted in

L41 - I would say "in the context of global change"

L42 - for our societies.

L50 - Hydrological droughts

L56 - " et rates, that cause low soil moisture content.. " I am not too familiar with this, but here I do not see a difference of gw droughts compared to
hydrological droughts.

L65 - according to the type of aquifer and GWL variation.

L69 - I would say that a water level higher than the soil surface is no groundwater anymore.

L86 - "However, although these indices are useful tools to describe droughts, their principal limit arises from the standardisation allowing for spatial comparison but therefore hindering to keep the variance notion in time series" You are stating important facts here, but especially the second part is difficult to follow. I suggest to split the sentence in 2 and explain better what you mean.

L89 - dependent on

L107 - .. highlighted, using a composite analysis with Sea Level Pressure (SLP), that the.. (comma insertions)

L119 - I don't understand. Please rephrase.

L122 - except the 1975 drought.

L126 - delete "to", replace "in supporting" with "on"

L132 - high- and low-frequency

L134 - Why exactly where these 7 and 17 year variabilities chosen? I think this needs explaining.
.. consists in evaluating

140 - Rephrase please
Boreholes were selected from a BRGM database and were required to be undisturbed from human activities. We selected the boreholes by following the three steps below.

the removal of pre-selected.

Do you mean sub-monthly?

were -> was

for that purpose

But isn't this also a consequence of the initial amplitude of exceedance?

I prefer the term variance, but this is a matter of preference.

Why not splitting the period exactly in half, doing the analysis for both periods and the complete period 1903-2019?

I wonder how the results are sensitive to the choice of 7/17 and 7&17 year variability. I think this has to be discussed or at least commented on.

typo

linked to -> resulting from

dating back to

Which aperiodic behaviour? I don't understand this sentence
L601 - largely -> generally