

Interactive comment on “Numerical modeling of the 2013 meteorite entry in Chebarkul Lake, Russia” by Andrey Kozelkov et al.

Andrey Kozelkov et al.

aakurkin@gmail.com

Received and published: 14 March 2017

The authors would like to thank the reviewer for their thoughtful and useful comments on our paper. Below we outline how we could address specific points raised by the reviewer in a revised manuscript.

1. Paper is very difficult to read due to many unclear statements dealing with too many details of calculations. This is particularly seen in Section 3. As the solution of the boundary-value problems was obtained using the package LOGOS, it will be sufficient to define the initial governing parameters and present the results of simulation in a more condense form.

We changed this section. We will keep here the initial governing parameters in revised form of our manuscript. Most of details will be moved from Section 3 to Appendix

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



because they can be important for modelers.

2. Hard copies of figures is very poor visible, especially Figs. 3, 8, 9 (scattering waves for particular time steps are almost non-distinguishable).

The quality of figures is improved due to higher resolutions.

4. Small remarks: a) page 4, line 15: ... “bottom deformable”, it means that bottom depth is not-uniform?

Sorry, it is mistake. The bottom is non-deformable

b) page 5, line 5: remark in the second sentence is not needed in terms of the first sentence

This sentence will be reformulated.

c) page 5, line 20: ... “meteorite covered a distance”, probably it should be ... meteorite moved a distance?

Sorry for mistake. It is corrected on: meteorite has passed a distance of about 27 meters

d) page 7, line 21: should be Fig. 10, not Fig. 8.

It will be corrected.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/nhess-2016-359, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)

