Dear Editor Dr. Filippo Catani,

We sincerely thank you for the efforts you have made to improve our submission to NHESS. We have responded to your comments. The sentences in blue font are your comments, those in black are our responses.

After reading and evaluating the reviews given by the referees, and after my personal check on your last version's manuscript, I guess we are almost finished and that your paper may be considered acceptable provided that you are able to answer a few remaining doubts:

- line 163 - Please provide some basis for the choice of using SRTM (year of acquisition 2000) instead of ALOS DSM (year of acquisition 2007 and 2010). Is the area under investigation outside the ALOS DSM dataset coverage?

We used SRTM DEM in this paper, because we have a plan to use SRTM DEM to calculate erosion distance for spread area of Issyk-Kul Basin. In this basin, the ALOS DSM has some gaps of coverage. This is now mentioned on lines 167-168.

- line 260 - the sentence "... much debris led to slow velocities..." is not clear. Please rephrase

We changed to

"Although the Jeruy drainage has a long eroded section which can indicate a fast flow, the flood here did not include many large boulders. The flow had relatively slow velocity on the alluvial fan."

- lines 300-306 - Could you add some considerations on cases that do not fall on or near the regression line in Fig. 9? You use eq. to compute volumes but what about cases where the fit is not good?

We added the following explanation:

"The larger-area lakes have volumes above the regression-line fit because those depressions tend to have steeper sides. Although we could use a second-order fit to better fit these points, our subsequent analyses below all use lakes with areas below 0.05 km2. Thus, we use the simpler first-order relation."

"

I will personally review the corrections that you will make, without recurring to a new review round.

I am confident that this will greatly expedite the publication process.

Thank you for choosing NHESS Journal.