

Referee Comments	Response
<p>1. you missed large amount of current published papers in this field, especially some of your quoted papers are some years old, please, can you update and add broader literature review in your paper in this field, Especially also work conducted outside of the US.</p>	<p>We cited a number of additional papers published between 2011 and 2019 some of which addressed disasters outside the U.S. For example, Tropical Cyclone Debbie (2017) caused widespread flooding in North Queensland, Australia and the affected communities experienced significant job and income losses. The analysis of 2017 Hurricane Maria’s impact on Puerto Rico focused on the displacement and job-seeking. Refer to Lines 54-62, and 65-75.</p>
<p>2. on page 2 line 41/43: you make the comparison between the impact of Hurricane Katrina on national economic growth: can you add a reference and further elaborate why you observe this slow down, show the economy of Louisiana and Mississippi that important role in the overall economy of the United States? Or was it more the large oil spills caused by Hurricane Katrina in the Gulf of Texas.</p>	<p>A few references were added to further explain the importance of oil production to the national economy. It stated in one paper that “Hurricane Katrina produced effect on 19% of U.S. oil production which cause the oil price to rise by \$3 a barrel, and gas price reached \$5 a gallon.” Refer to Line 45- 48.</p>
<p>3. on page 4 line 119-136: why you observe this temporary change:because of bankruptcy of businesses, lack of insurance payments or because of labor market system in terms of unemployment or because of the businesses were temporary closed? Can you elaborate this in a more detail and provide also some details about the US labor market also in terms of unemployment benefits? Can you also provide a more in-depth overview, which sectors were mainly cause this temporary short-</p>	<p>This section serves as an initial observation of employment changes in selected counties in the aftermath of hurricanes. The distinction between temporary and permanent impacts was later determined by the ARIMA model analysis in the subsequent section.</p> <p>We explained the results through the prism of community resilience based on five capitals -social, economic, human, physical and natural. Your suggestions were fully considered.</p>

<p>fall (service sector, productive sector etc.), was this more likely for large businesses or small-medium enterprises, can you also provide a more geographical overview where the unemployment rate increased after the event. Can you also observe any changes in the local consumption, house price, inflation, credit, debt rate?</p>	
<p>4. on page 7 line 211: a major question is: which type of jobs got lost (based on which economic sector and how this sector is regulated/organized in the US?).</p>	<p>We plotted additional figures based on employment data in Houston and New Orleans MSA to illustrate the employment changes in various industry sectors. Refer to Line 251-275</p>
<p>5. page 9: discussion is somehow missing, please link your results with other international references?</p>	<p>“Qualitative Explanation of the Results” was relabeled as Section 5. We also added some international references to explain the results. Refer to Line 294- 297, and 328-330.</p>
<p>6. In overall can you observe any changes in the long-run growth rate in your model/examples?</p>	<p>In this study, Hurricane Katrina was shown to produce permanent impact on Orleans Parish County. References were added to define the threshold for permanent effect as 3 years or longer.</p>
<p>7. Don’t use the term natural disasters term “natural disaster” is a misnomer. Disasters such as hurricanes and earthquakes result from a combination of natural hazards and social and human vulnerability. Calling them ‘natural disasters’ artificially naturalises the harms they cause.</p>	<p>We used the term of “Natural Disasters” throughout this paper to differentiate from man-made disasters (e.g. terrorist attack). A sentence was added at the beginning to clarify. Refer to Line 24.</p>

Short Comment	Response
<p>1. Qualitative Section (Lines 233 – 292)</p> <p>First, shouldn't this section be separate from Section 4?</p>	<p>As suggested, Qualitative Section was renumbered to Section 5.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>We cited prior research on the factors contributing to community resilience and supporting the result of our ARIMA models.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>We addressed this point. Refer to Line 295-300.</p>
<p>4. Then the statement is made that Fort Bend County is deficient in natural and human capital. Based on what?</p>	<p>The contracting evidences between the ARIMA model and reported major power outage led to the speculation of deficiencies in natural and human capitals. This point was removed due to the lack of clear evidence.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p>As the part of future work, we could conduct a survey on how organizations adapt to hurricanes. We could also investigate whether the community has specific programs to promote hazard communication, business continuity.</p>
<p>Line numbers: 40, 60, 69, 79, 89, 94, 152, 164, 200, 202, 207, 226, 250, 253</p>	<p>Your suggestions are much appreciated. We corrected these errors.</p>