Dear Reviewer,

It looks like we are agreed on the technical content of our comment paper and as the paper of Polom et al. (2018) was a subject of a peer reviewing it is expected to be without technical errors. We only underline that the reported results are obtained using limited data sets and using assumptions. As well as other reported results.

The question is what should be a comment paper. We are disagreed on this subject.

If we were follow your arguments about the content of a comment paper, then it would be difficult to see where the difference between a research paper and a comment paper is.

We put this comment because Polom et al. (2018) insist that their results are obtained using modern geophysical measuring procedure and data processing. One may understand that this is the final (and assumed improved) result that replaces all previous studies. However, we have seen that it is not true and the results published by Polom et al. (2018) are within the principal uncertainty of the seismic method as well as the results published before. So, from the technical point of view, it is just another interpretation of the field measurements.

Such a conclusion is not a problem for geophysicists who have practical experience. However, it is a strong message for a wide range of non-geophysicists reading this paper who often read the summary and the conclusions. We have numerous contacts with local authorities both in Israel and in Jordan and we know that scientific results attract serious attention also of non-geophysicists.

If the Red-Dead Sea channel will be built, then it will boost the economic activity in the region and hence the subject of the natural hazard is a matter of growing importance. Local authorities, investors and decision makers need an objective expertise that is as close to the reality as possible. Unfortunately, the actual level of knowledge does not allow to know the ground truth without uncertainty.

Thus, our comment paper is a message of warning about necessary attention to pay to the reported geophysical results.

It is similar to the case when in publications it may be written “the content of this paper is under the entire responsibility of the authors and not of the journal”.

With respect to your wishing that we should write the new article we note that our results and models are published worldwide and part of them devoted to Jordanian side of the Dead Sea (see references below, articles devoted to the Ghor Al-Haditha area are marked by yellow). Latter article is under consideration and we will inform you when it will be published.
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