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We thank the reviewer for the positive feedback and constructive comments to improve the manuscript. We will revise the manuscript according to the suggestions made and provide a point-wise rebuttal later. Below we provide a first author response to the main comments. Referee comments are repeated in bold.

**Overall comment.** As this article illustrates selected use cases from a complex drought risk assessment framework and a larger body of work in a relatively short article, care should be taken to provide enough details or references in the methodological sections, make sure terminology for e.g. the scenarios is used consistently and references to analyses or results that are not discussed in detail are omitted or discussed in more detail.

It is true that the manuscript discusses only a selection of the results of a larger study. We will carefully check whether methodological details and references are sufficient for the reader to understand the results, and that references to analyses that are not discussed will be omitted.

**Main comment in pdf. Why exactly were these 5 policy actions selected? Can they be considered representative for the range of policy actions in the "extensive list"?**

We selected five policy actions for this paper from an extensive list of about 150 policy actions. They serve as an example for the applicability of the risk assessment framework. We therefore chose actions that fall into either of two main categories of drought risk policy actions (reduce demand or increase supply) and that have an effect on national drought risk. Furthermore, we omitted local actions and actions aimed at research (e.g. local pilot studies). The presented approach is less suited for local measures that require detailed system knowledge and do not affect regional or national water distribution. We will clarify this in the revised manuscript.