

Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., author comment AC1  
<https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-86-AC1>, 2021  
© Author(s) 2021. This work is distributed under  
the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

## Reply on RC1

Mathias Raschke

---

Author comment on "About the return period of a catastrophe" by Mathias Raschke, Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/nhess-2021-86-AC1>, 2021

---

Dear Dr Francesco Serinaldi,

Thank you very much for all your effort regarding my manuscript (MS) and the helpful comments, notes and advice. I will consider some of these directly in a revision. However, I will also reject some of your concerns by arguments. Before, I would like to give following general reflections.

I aware that my English is poor and awkward. Therefore, I used already the help (proofreading) by two colleagues. The outcome of this procedure is unfortunately not good. Besides, I am not in the privileged position wot be paid for research and writing scientific papers in English. I rarely publish also because I do science with my personal limited resources. Nonetheless, I will use a more professional service after a revision. The mathematical notation was already validated by a mathematician for the current submission.

Furthermore, there is no uniformity in scientific writing. The explanation style is extreme short in Mathematics compared (e.g.) with social sciences. I am more oriented to the first and prefer sparsity.

Besides, I was not sure about the level of mathematical/stochastic expertise of the different (and fragmented) science communities which deals with natural catastrophes. According to your and the other reviewers commends, more mathematical explanations are needed. I will add a subsection. However, I don't want to explain too many details which would be trivial for a student in mathematics (may be 3rd semester). A higher level of statistical expertise of the reader is assumed what I will mention in a revised introduction.

In addition, I will change the structure of the MS in a revision. Nevertheless, I underline that there are very different accepted or even prescribed structures for scientific papers (e.g., Nature Scientific Reports). And I keep the distinction between the new approach (CRP as main result) and technical details for the demonstration example.

My detailed replies to your comments are below.

Once more, thank you very much for your advice, notes and comments.

Sincerely,

Mathias Raschke

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<https://nhess.copernicus.org/preprints/nhess-2021-86/nhess-2021-86-AC1-supplement.pdf>