

Firstly, we would like to thank the reviewer for devoting time to reviewing our manuscript. In the following we will discuss the issues raised by the reviewer and hopefully answer all questions satisfactorily

In case of acceptance of our paper by CoP, we shall watch to complete our literature review from your references which we use already partially (Garcia-Herrera, Boose, Caviedes, Chenoweth). With regard to these authors, we try simply to explain that their sources are essentially second hand sources compiled since the 19th century and systematically used (wrongly in our opinion) in the publications of the last thirty years. We shall also make the same work (literature review) for the section on the climatology.

We thank you for technical corrections, we shall correct them in case of acceptance by CoP. We shall remove the references to the modelling. About the date of 1789, it marks a fundamental break in the French history because the French Revolution puts an end to a millennium of monarchic government. After 1789 France has from now on a Republic.

We can completely remove the section 4.2 which, according to you, repeats what was already said. On the other hand, we think that the section 5 must be kept because it ensues directly from the contents of our archives which describe the damage caused by cyclones. Yet, this type of information is strategic for reinsurers and States eager to estimate the cost of the future disasters. Indeed, the available series are recent (less than 30 years) and consequently, more older estimations are necessary for policy-makers, modellers and insurers.

Nevertheless, we understand perfectly your scientific reluctances and think that our approach based on new purely historical sources and a reconstruction based on the method of the Reinsurers of climatic risks confuses you. The review "Climate of the Past" is not maybe the good review to publish this type of very unusual researches and we are sorry about it.