Dear Reviewer:

Thanks very much for your comments concerning our manuscript entitled "Measuring and Characterizing Community Recovery to Earthquake: the Case of 2008 Wenchuan Earthquake, China" (ID: nhess-2017-72). Those comments are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our paper, as well as the important guiding significance to our researches. We have studied comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with approval. The revised paper has been uploaded in the supplement file, and the added and revised sentences and paragraphs have been marked red in the revised paper. The main corrections in the paper and the responds
to the reviewer’s comments are as flowing:

We are very sorry that we can’t provide a clear explanations of the assessment results of Wenchuan’s recovery to earthquake. According to the reviewer’s comments, in the revised paper, we have redrawn the figures (Figure 7, 8, 9, 10, 11), and rewritten the section 4 Results to help readers to understand what we can obtain from the methods and how to interpret it. For example: (1)We have provided an explanation of the interrelated phases of the recovery and reconstruction process(page 14, line 768-802). That we have divided the recovery and reconstruction process into three interrelated phases (shown in Figure 7), which can be used to determine the recovery degrees of four dimensions of community recovery at different time phases.

(2) We have moved the concept of 4 dimensions of community recovery respectively into 4.1-4.4. And we have added a lot of explanation of the assessment results of each dimension of Wenchuan’s recovery to earthquake, which has been marked red (page 15, line 814-page 20, line 1151). And all of the Figures (figure 8-11) have been redrawn. And each figure which has shown the assessment result of the four dimensions (population, economy, building and infrastructure) of Wenchuan recovery has been illustrated in detail in the section 4.1 (page 15, line 814-page 16, line 893), 4.2 (page 16, line 898-page 17, line 1002), 4.3 (page 18, line 1007-1078), 4.4 (page 19, line 1082-page 20, line 1148), and marked red in these sections. We wish these revisions can provide a clearer interpretation of the assessment results.

We have tried our best to improve the manuscript and made some changes in the manuscript. These changes will not influence the content and framework of the paper. And the revised manuscript has been typeset according to the format of NHESS. We appreciate for Editors (Thomas Thaler) and Reviewer’s warm work earnestly, and hope that the correction will meet with approval. Once again, thanks very much for editors (Thomas Thaler) and the Reviewer’s comments and suggestions.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:
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