

Dear Pascal,

Many thanks for these final comments and suggestions. They once again proved very helpful. We made nearly all the relevant changes: we changed to a gender neutral language, and adopted the numerous helpful stylistic and minor suggestions

There are four quick things to note:

1. We left the reference to Roeger et.al. 2004. The paper draws on nearest neighbour forecasting method (the term appears 22 times) but admittedly doesn't discuss the method in much detail. It uses the method mainly in relation to the underlying weather forecasts that then feed into the avalanche forecasting. But also, more importantly, it's just the kind of paper that adopts the type of methodology we take issue with: different skill measures, that we argue are not useful, are used and listed but their relevance to forecast choice is not discussed. So, we would like to leave this reference in if that is ok.
2. We added the two references you mentioned and while digging into these papers more we realised that we should also cite one of the earlier uses of NN forecasting by McClung – so we added a reference to McClung and Tweedy 1993 as well.
3. About Doolittle: Volume 10 of the Bulletin of the Philosophical Society of Washington contains a record of the proceedings of the society during 1887; however, it was published in 1888 (see the bottom of the dropbox file's titlepage you sent where the year 1888 is listed). Also, 1888 is the date commonly given in the literature, so we prefer to go with the publication date of the proceedings rather than the date of the proceedings. (And of course our use of "1988" was corrected as this was a typo.)
4. Many thanks for the article on the danger scale. It was very Interesting to see how local and regional forecasting needs already then divided opinions. I changed the relevant passage to make it less about the actual introduction of the European Danger Scale. Maybe it's time for a historical discussion of these different risk communication scales....

Finally, many thanks from Peter and myself. We really appreciate the work you put into this as the editor and your comments proved extremely helpful and supportive. It's always such a challenge to publish interdisciplinary work and you really helped us here.

Thanks
Philip