

Short Comment	
1. Qualitative Section (Lines 233 – 292) First, shouldn't this section be separate from Section 4?	As suggested, Qualitative Section will be renumbered to 5.
2. Qualitative Explanation of the results, this is the weakest piece of the author's argument. I don't see it as a qualitative analysis of resilience in the aftermath of both Katrina and Ike but simply a recitation of information provided by other entities	We have cited past researches on the factors contributing to community resilience and supporting the result of our ARIMA models.
3. Studies which interviewed residents after the storms and compared their assessment would make a better case than listing how the difference in warnings made residents better prepared.	We will add this point to our paper.
4. Then the statement is made that Fort Bend County is deficient in natural and human capital. Based on what?	The contracting evidences between the ARIMA model and reported major power outage led to the speculation of deficiencies in natural and human capitals. This has been removed.
5. Beginning on line 278 the authors quote Abel et al (2006) about the ability to self-organize is an important element in resilience. Great point. How can they show that this happened in some places and not others without citing or conducting a qualitative study to show that?	As the part of future work, we could conduct a survey on how organizations of a community adapt to hurricanes. We could also investigate whether the community has specific programs to promote hazard communication. Same can be done to businesses affected by hurricanes.
Line numbers: 40, 60, 69, 79, 89, 94, 152, 164, 200, 202, 207, 226, 250, 253	We have corrected these errors. Your suggestions are much appreciated.