Referee: J. Fuller	Email: jon@jefuller.com

Question #1.

It was surprising to see the authors accept use of the FAN methodology as part of their recommended procedure, given their acknowledgement of its many weaknesses. The FAN methodology is outdated and based on bad science. It should no longer be used in modern assessments of flood hazards on alluvial fans.

Answer to question #1.

As you mentioned, FAN model is outdated and is based on bad science regarding estimation of the flow depth and velocity. However, In this study, only the probability of flood occurrence from apex was considered from FAN model output. Therefore, to compensate for the model's shortage in respect of velocity and depth calculations, a combination of FAN and FLO-2D was implemented.

Question #2.

The fan model does NOT predict avulsions (p. 2, line 18). FAN merely assumes that avulsions will always occur, and predicts the probability-weighted depths and velocities of the 1% chance event, i.e., it (incorrectly) predicts the consequences of avulsions. It does not predict whether or where avulsions will occur. According to FAN, avulsions always occur.

Answer to question #2.

The sentence "In addition, it is a simple model which could predict avulsion" has been corrected to: "In addition, it is a simple model which could predict flood risk".

Question #3.

The article mentions the mapping of geomorphically active (young) and inactive (old) surfaces, but there is no map provided other than the NDVI images. These images are not labelled to distinguish the old and young surfaces. The inadequacies of the FAN method become glaringly apparent when comparing maps of actual floods on fan surfaces, geomorphic surface maps, FLO2D inundation maps (all of which have similar shapes and extents) to FAN model results, which stand out in shape, extent, and depth. Enhanced discussion of the surficial mapping element of the study would greatly improve the findings.

Answer to question #3.

To determine the geomorphological properties, in addition of using field inspections' data and Arial images, vegetation effects of the study area were employed by incorporating the NDVI (Normalized Difference Vegetation Index".

Question #4.

The article should clarify how the lateral and distal extents of the fan were determined.

Answer to question #4.

To determine the lateral and distal extents of the fan, historical information along with Arial images and elevation maps were considered.

Question #5.

FLO2D is a useful model for depicting flood hazards on fan surfaces, but the application should include more than a single model with only one hydrograph.

Answer to question #5.

The main objective of this paper was to propose a new approach to enhance flooding hazard in Fans while using minimum data, so only a typical hydrograph was the subject of this study. However, different hydrographs can be considered in future studies for different flooding scenarios.