

Review 2: Alexander Hall (Referee)

This is an interesting and timely paper, and I recommend that following minor revisions it should be accepted for publication.

**Response: I thank the reviewer for the helpful comments and suggestions.**

In keeping with the comments from reviewer 1, I think the author should re-frame the paper to be explicitly about S.E. England, in addition to amending the title to reflect this focus, clearer framing in the introduction and section 2 could be added.

**Response: The title of the paper will be changed to focus on southern and eastern England. The regional focus is already highlighted at the start of section 2.**

Given the centrality of the sources to the paper, would the author be able to include Table S1 in-line in the text of the paper? If not in full, an amended or overview version would help the reader interested more in the historical context of the sources in gaining a quick overview of the kind of narrative sources used in the study.

**Response: The paper is already very long. Due to the constraints on length and the generally more natural-science oriented audience of the journal, long source citations are allocated to the supplementary information.**

In section 6 I would like the author to add a paragraph reflecting on the ability to assess the direct causality of adaptation measures, were they measures triggered solely by drought events, were they catalysed by meteorological conditions etc.

**Response: See response to reviewer 1.**

As per the corrections and comments on the attached PDF the author needs to give the manuscript a thorough proof read and review prior to resubmitting. In addition to minor amends on typographical errors, the author should ensure all sentences and paragraphs are clear, avoiding long and unwieldy sentence structures where possible.

**Response: In accordance with the suggestions by reviewer 1 the manuscript will be amended as necessary.**