

Dear editor,

Thank you for the suggestions to improve our paper.

Please find below a point-by point answer to your seven comments:

1. I fully agree with you that the paper is long. This is because it gathers a significant amount of work that started in 2018 where not only my personal research activities are explained, but also of my colleagues. Therefore, due to the very short time we got to revise the manuscript, I cannot reduce considerably the text of the paper without being fully approved once again by the other six coauthors. Also, considering that all the content written in the last submitted version was already approved by my colleagues after several months of checking it out, I doubt they will want to reduce their own contributions.

Personally I consider that the manner the introduction and method parts are presented make the paper pedagogic enough to explain the paradigms we are tracking on. Moreover, please note that our paper contains many references and large figures (lots of them of the size of one page, which logically increase the amount of pages. The final count of words is 15,727, an average number for a complete research paper. This version contains only 1,565 words more (around one page of full content) in comparison with the first submitted version in March 98, 2021, a low number considering it already has all the required content by four reviewers. Having said that, I will be sincerely thankful if you allow us keeping the parts where we present the introduction, method and results as they were presented in the last submitted version. Thanks for your understanding.

2. Following your advice I have considerably reduced the Conclusion section. As suggested, I have moved some parts to the Discussion part. It really makes sense. I deeply thank you for this helpful recommendation. The relocated parts are highlighted in the author's track-changes file.
3. Indeed, in the answer provided to Dr. Mario Salgado we provide one figure (Figure 1 in that response text) as requested by him. Thus, this was just for illustrative purposes. Please note that in that answer we provide a complete explanation about the reasons why these comparison, in our opinion, does not make much sense. Thereby, we clearly wrote the following: *"Therefore, we consider that it would not very meaningful to the reader if we provide a graphical comparison of these two fragility models. Accordingly, in the journal paper we would prefer to avoid doing so"*. Thus, that figure was not provided in the revised version of the manuscript. Since Dr. Mario Salgado did not make any comment in this regard, we consider that our suggestion was accepted.

The minor issues listed as comments **4**, **5** and **7** regarding the modification of figures, and the units in one table (comment **6**) have been successfully solved in the updated version of the manuscript.

We sincerely thank you for your time. With best regards,

Juan Camilo Gomez-Zapata on behalf of the team of authors