



**SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
<p><b>Comments on Paper ( Ms_IJECC_48758)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The title is too long</li> <li>- According to citation, Sometimes, it is mentioned the name of the author (Reference) and also a number. For example: <b>The OCHA [9]</b> in page 6, I think it should written only the name of the author or a number in two brackets, not both of them. Therefore the author must re-checked all the references within the manuscript and make citations in a proper way consistent with journal instructions.</li> <li>- The header in Table 2 must be re-edited to be easily readable.</li> <li>- In Page 7, The size of words is 11, and it should be 12 as other parts of the paper, Therefore, the author should unify and re-edit the word size in the whole manuscript.</li> <li>- The author should correct the minor comments written inside the manuscript.</li> <li>- I agree with Reviewer #3, in that the Catastrophes always GEOLOGICAL not GEOPHYSICAL; and the author must change accordingly.</li> <li>- <b>In general, I see the author is response and did most of the requested corrections and comments.</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Title of paper has been shortened</b></p> <p><b>The in-text citations corrected all through the manuscript consistent with journal instructions</b></p> <p><b>The header in Table 2 edited</b></p> <p><b>In Page 7, The size of words corrected to 12</b></p> <p><b>Author corrected the minor comments written inside the manuscript.</b></p> <p><b>the Catastrophes always GEOLOGICAL not GEOPHYSICAL: Please, I do not understand the argument as it relates to our presentation in the manuscript. This is because catastrophes were disaggregated according to source. We never alluded that catastrophe is geophysical!</b></p>