

[Interactive
Comment](#)

***Interactive comment on* “Evaluation of the initial stage of the reactivated Cotopaxi volcano – analysis of the first ejected fine-grained material” by T. Toulkeridis et al.**

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 22 January 2016

Dear authors,

I would add to small comments, concerning to the author’s statement that I am contradicting myself.

I kindly suggest to careful read the paper of Cashman and Hoblitt (2004), in this paper the authors describe some ash samples from phreatic explosions of March 1980 of Mt. St. Helens, which were previously interpreted as phreatic and then re-interpreted as juvenile material. This seems to me a good example for comparing the Cotopaxi data with those of other well-known volcanoes.

In my comment, I mentioned that your samples do not seem to be cleaned and as a
C3029

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)



result very fine material rest on the ash surface. This fact is very important to evaluate the composition of ash samples due to its heterogeneity. My comment refers to the fact that I do not understand what exactly the authors are analyzing.

Best regards

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 6947, 2015.

[Interactive
Comment](#)

[Full Screen / Esc](#)

[Printer-friendly Version](#)

[Interactive Discussion](#)

[Discussion Paper](#)