

**Editor Decision: Reconsider after major revisions** (20 Jul 2020) by [Andrea Kiss](#)

Comments to the Author:

Dear Authors,

thank you for the valuable manuscript. As the authors in their replies practically in all cases agreed, and willing to follow the clear and substantial comments and suggestions of the two referees, I only have a few, additional remarks: please, try to follow the requirements of the journal regarding the structuring of your paper (esp. regarding your "Results" chapter, but also there could be more and separate "Discussion"). Another remark is related to the referee comment on the uncertainties around the "database": this could be solved, for example, with a Supplementary table similar to e.g. the paper "Retsö 2015" in the HESS journal (about floods in Sweden roughly for the same period). There the lead author provided the key description of each event with a few words or max. a sentence. Lengthy text quotations, especially if it should be first translated from Swedish, does not necessarily provide more help to the readers than a short concise text. As for removing the figures: transforming/modifying figures to a more complex representation of the data and analysis discussed might be a better solution than to entirely remove those figures.

Thank you, and I look forward to read your revised manuscript.

**Reply to Editor Decision:**

Dear Editor,

We have now changed the following items:

- 1) A clearer distinction has been made between "Results" and "Discussion and conclusions".
- 2) A year-by-year supplementary table (similar to the one in Retsö 2015) has been provided and substitutes the previous period table.
- 3) The figures/graphs have been improved.

Best regards,

Dag Retsö and Lotta Leijonhufvud