

**Cover letter for the revised version of our article: “*A 240 year History of Avalanche Risk in the Vosges Mountains from Nonconventional Sources*”,
submitted to **Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences****

Dear Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences editorial board, dear Dr. Sven Fuchs, dear referees,

Thank you very much for the publication of our article in Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences Discussion, and for the encouragements and valuable comments conveyed by the two referee reports. These have been very useful for us to improve the paper. We have addressed each of their concerns as outlined below. The corresponding changes have been included in a revised version of the paper we have prepared and that we would be glad to submit to your kind consideration.

Both referee reports agreed upon the high interest of the topic of the paper, and upon the adequacy of the approach and methods we have employed. Also, the referees both agreed upon the need of solving several formal issues. According to this statement and to the detailed comments kindly provided by the referees, we have deeply reworked all the formal aspects of the paper. Modifications made include:

- A slight overall reorganization to better distinguish the content of the different sections. Also, the discussion section has been slightly expanded to put our results in perspective with regards to a larger context;
- A real effort for precisising and defining the exact meaning of all the terms we are using, especially of those related to the typology of avalanche events, and also of those arising from the fields of history and social science (and therefore arguably less familiar to natural hazards (geo)scientists). To this end, we have included an additional table in the text core, which contains the definition of such terms;
- Suppression of all footnotes, with inclusion of the relevant information within the text core;
- Yet, significant shortening of the text core;
- Correction of all typos, awkward sentences, etc., and further English smoothing by a professional English corrector.

However, we want to stress that the first author has her background in history, and that the main outcome of the paper, in addition to specific findings for the case study, is the contribution of this discipline to the better understanding of the evolution of natural hazards on the long range. This has two consequences for the paper:

- First, the data/result/discussion organization may remain a bit different from the one of a pure geoscience paper. Specifically, analyzing the source amount, quality and evolution through time clearly belongs, for the historian, to the results section and not only to the discussion section. It is even one of the most important points of the work to illustrate that the two aspects cannot be truly distinguished.
- Second, the text style remains truly a bit more literary than in standard geoscience articles. As stated before, we have polished the paper with regards to the first submission, which should contribute to make it easier and more convenient to read for the NHESS readership. Yet, we don't want to completely get rid of these intrinsic specificities of the work, which also contribute, in our opinion, to its value.

By the way, we provide in specific comments a point-by-point answer to the two referee reports in the online discussion.

All in all, we feel that the new version of the paper is much clearer and more precise, and hope that this will make it adequate for publication in *Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences*.

With best regards,

Florie Giacona, for the authors.