

This paper presents the reconstruction an extreme drought and flood events history in the Hanjiang River basin since 1426 using historical documents, it gives an insight into the understanding the history of extreme climate events in the study region. My main comments about this paper are that:

1. The Introduction is too long and has no focus. This section should write based on the first words in Abstract. Some paragraphs are not related to the topic of this paper, and some could be moved to the Discussion. For example, the sixth paragraph just give some results of previous studies, and has no meaning. The second to the last paragraph should be put in the front of the Introduction. Generally, this part should be organized based on the logic of your Abstract.
2. Line 145-146: how do you get this result, it is from previous studies or you're your own analysis? I suggest the authors to give some analysis of extreme droughts and floods based on the instrumental data. It is important to support your results obtained from historical records, especially when you make comparisons between your series with ENSO events. Is there significant relationship between instrumental extreme events and ENSO events?
3. Figure 2: from this figure, it is obvious that drought and flood records in early periods are fewer than recent periods, and this may result from the fewer documents in early periods. Do you consider some correction method or give different weight for different periods?
4. Section 3.2.2: this section is difficult to read. It is better to give a table presenting the corresponding ENSO and droughts/floods events in history. ENSO is a complicated phenomenon, and its interaction with Asia monsoon is also complicated, the discussion in this part is too simple.
5. Line 445-448: "However, the correlation between extreme droughts/floods and large volcanic eruptions are not significant in the other eras.", Why? Are there any other factors influencing the extreme droughts/floods? Why the large volcanic eruptions influence extremes at the 1430s-1450s and 1640s-1660s? I think the authors should carefully consider this section, you can not compare for the sake of compare.