Response to Reviewer 2 (Round 2) Comments

Dear Reviewer:

Thank you for your review of our manuscript (water-481677). All your suggestions are very important, and they have important guiding significance for my thesis writing and scientific research work. In response to your round 2 comments, we make the following reply.

**Point 1:**
Small font of the figure.

**Response 1:**
Thank you for your cues. We optimized the Figure 1, mainly to increase the font size of some legends’ texts. Due to the limitation of 300dpi resolution, for some annotative texts that can't be enlarged and are not very important (the part in the map of China), we have deleted them to achieve a better look. We hope that you would find it satisfactory.

**Point 2:**
The choice of reference could be supplemented with respect to the risk definition.

**Response 2:**
Thank you for your suggestion. We’ve added the corresponding content summarizing the risk definition and the risk decision of the reservoir group dispatching in flood season at page 2, line 61-74. And some references ([5] - [11]) have been supplemented including the literature you mentioned. Please review it.
Point 3:
The last point of the article contains in fact only the conclusions relating to the researched case study, but there is no more detailed perspective.

Response 3:
Thank you for pointing out the deficiency of our manuscript. We have added a summary of our research and the probable applicability of our research methods and conclusions at page 17, line 552-567. Meanwhile we have transferred the description of the limitations of our research (we added in the last revised version) from the end of the article to the end of this section. Please review it. We hope you will find it satisfactory.

Thanks again for your advice and hope to learn more from you.
Best regards.

Yours sincerely,
Xiaokuan Ni, Zengchuan Dong, Wei Xie, Wenhao Jia, Changgui Duan, Hongyi Yao