We would like to thank you for carefully reading our manuscript and for your constructive comments and suggestions. We have revised the manuscript accordingly and believe that these changes have substantially improved the clarity of the database's applications and limitations. Below, we provide our responses to each of your comments.

## Major comments:

**MC1:** We appreciate the reviewer's observation. To address this, we have added a sentence in the Hydrological data section highlighting the need to consider differences between past and present land use, as these may cause substantial variations in flood magnitudes within the same basin.

**MC2**: To avoid confusion, we have replaced the abbreviation  $Q/A_{max}$  with  $Qs_{max}$  (maximum specific discharge recorded at each sampling site). In addition, we have added a new column, "A", indicating the drainage area (km²), and specified in the footnotes that this refers to the drainage surface area up to the sampling site.

**MC3** and **MC4**: We have revised the manuscript to clarify that the PaleoRiada dataset is biased towards larger events, that discharge estimates may be under- or overestimated, and that long-term channel changes may affect the estimation of hydrological data. We also note that smaller and more frequent floods are typically absent, and these limitations should therefore be considered in flood frequency analysis.

**MC5:** We thank the reviewer for highlighting the importance of transmission losses and their role in linking surface flows to groundwater recharge. We have revised Section 6 ("Applications") to include this aspect.

All minor comments and corrections have been addressed in the revised manuscript. Specifically, the terminology regarding flood records has been clarified, and Table 6 has been updated to include the suggested records and references. Figure 6 captions have been amended to specify the relevant rivers, and references to Fig. 6a, 6b and 6c have been added to Sections 6.2.1–6.2.3 accordingly.

We are grateful for your valuable feedback, which has helped us strengthen the manuscript.