

Interactive comment on “A retrospective study of the pre-eruptive unrest on El Hierro (Canary Islands): implications of seismicity and deformation in the short-term volcanic hazard assessment” by Stefania Bartolini et al.

Stefania Bartolini et al.

sbartolini.1984@gmail.com

Received and published: 5 April 2018

We would like to thank the Anonymus Referee #2 for her/his comments useful to improve some aspects of our manuscript.

We here reply point by point at the comments:

1. Line 165: "GPS station began to rotate to the North". Perhaps the authors mean that the GPS station translated towards North.

C1

Changed

2. Line 215: "Data was grouped" -> "Data were grouped"

Modified

3. Lines 254-256: The authors consider as a new parameter the "slope of the inverse of the RSAM". This is not clear, since it could be interpreted either as the instantaneous derivative respect to time of the parameter (1/RSAM) [ie: $d(1/RSAM)/dt$] or the slope of (1/RSAM) taken in a larger time-window (eg: the slope of the line best-fitting 1/RSAM, etc.). Moreover, this new parameter is not reported in the figures.

We consider the slope of the line best-fitting (1/RSAM). Modified in Table 1 and in the Supplementary material the RSAM with (1/RSAM)

4. Line 367: "eruptive phase". Do you mean "unrest phase"?

We refer to the eruptive phase, because after previous unrest phases the system is getting ready to erupt

5. Line 439: It seems that the eruption began 11 October, in contrast with line 152 (10 October).

Modified

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2017-243>, 2017.

C2