

Authors response to comments by the Editor

Manuscript reference number: nhess-2018-85

Manuscript title: Evaluation of predictive models for post-fire debris flows occurrence in the western United States.

We would like to thank the editor for his comments. We have revised the manuscript according to these comments and below we provide our detailed response. Comments from the editor are in black font and our response in blue font.

1. We have accepted all suggestions for corrections in text and additions in references etc. Please see the revised manuscript submitted.

2. Page 9: “*From all the different combinations of variables tested (results not shown)...*”
Unclear what you mean here. For what reasons these results are not shown? There is really the need to have this? Please clarify

Response

We removed “(results not shown)” to improve clarity.

3. Page 17: “*...we did not account for uncertainty in input parameters*”
Could you please add a few words to explain the reasons for this?

Response

We have modified/expand corresponding text, as follows, to further clarify this point.

“To investigate the impact of input parameter uncertainty we need to first statistically characterize and quantify uncertainty of each input source and then propagate the various uncertainties through the predictive models and evaluate uncertainty in the final predictions. This goes beyond the scope of current work and thus will be a topic of future research.”