

July 16, 2020

Prof. Oded Katz

Editor

Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences

REF: MS # nhess-2020-86

Dear Prof. Katz:

We are writing to you directly (with copy to the journal) due to some confusion concerning the correspondence mediated by the referees and the editorial system. Let me list the exchanges to date:

Concerning Referee 1

May 19: RC1 "Reviewer's comments" a detailed list of suggestions indicating the lines where to improve the paper.

June 06: AC1 "Reply to Referee 1" where we point out that we followed the suggestions of the referee line by line; the answers were in the new text itself as stated in our Reply. Since it was not possible to upload the new version we sent it to the editorial office on this date; apparently this new version was not forwarded neither to the referee or to you.

June 08 AC3 "Revised version of the paper" we let the referee know that the new version of the paper including all corrections he/she suggested was available.

Concerning Referee 2

May 30: RC2 "Review" Several comments and suggestions by Referee 2.

June 06: AC2 "Answer to Referee 2". We tell the referee how we considered each one of the points in his/her review.

June 08: RC3: "Accept". Referee 2 accepts our response and says that "the article can be published now".

June 19: AC4: "Reply to Referee 2" we thank him/her for the valuable comments.

We send herewith the version of the new manuscript where we have highlighted the answers to each referee: in cyan aspects dealing with the detailed points raised by Referee 1 and in purple answers to the queries and comments of Referee 2. You will see that all comments of both referees have been fully considered. Answers to both referees are also included.

We hope you can help us to continue ahead to get the approval of our paper.

Best regards

Eugenio E. Vogel

Corresponding Author

MS # nhess-2020-86