

Dear Dr. Igo Paulino,  
Topical Editor  
Annales Geophysicae (ANGEO)

**Ref** : angeo-2019-97  
**Title** : Historical Aurora Borealis Observations in Anatolia during medieval period: Implications for the past solar activity  
**Journal** : Annales Geophysicae (ANGEO)

Thank you for your constructive comments. I have just revised the manuscript in view of the your comments as outlined in detail below and the paper is now ready to resubmit the journal of Annales Geophysicae (ANGEO) titled “Historical Aurora Borealis catalog for Anatolia and Constantinople (hABcAC) in the medieval period: Implications for the past solar activity”. Please find our response to reviewer’s comments step by step below.

I would like to thank the reviewers for their thoughtful comments. Responses to comments are presented in the following pages along with explanations.

Thanks again and looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,  
**Dr. Nafiz MADEN**  
Corresponding author

## Detailed Response to Editor

1. **Title:** Please see again the comment #5 from the Reviewer #2. Please revise Line 282 accordingly.

*Reply: The title of the manuscript is revised as “Historical Aurora Borealis catalog for Anatolia and **Constantinople** (hABcAC) in the medieval period: Implications for the past solar activity”.*

2. **Abstract:** Although Constantinople is close to Anatolia, it is not correct to use data from Constantinople to investigate changes in Anatolia, without mention that the data come from Europe. If you think that the European data are important to the conclusions, revise throughout the manuscripts and include Europe/Anatolia elsewhere you mention the data, including Tables and statements. I have read the mistake, at least in Lines 89--102 and Line 103. Tables including their caption must be revised as well.

*Reply: The paragraph is revised*

3. **Introduction:** Please, revise the aim of this work and make sure that the conclusions from your work match with the goals. It is very important to be clear about the novelty of the present work during the Introduction section as well. Please, see again the comment #1 from the Reviewer #2.

*Reply: The aim of this work is revised.*

4. **Figure 1:** See again the comment #4 from the Reviewer #2. I would recommend including in the Caption of Figure 1 that Constantinople was always on the European side.

*Reply: Figure and its caption are revised .*

5. **Conclusion:** Again, I agree with the Reviewer #2 and the conclusions must be fully revised. Please, keep only the findings from your work, considering your discussion and that you are sure that your work has figured out.

*Reply: The conclusion section is revised.*

6. **Acknowledgements:** I would recommend to you keeping only the first statement. So, the Copernicus production will include statements about the reviewers and Editor.

*Reply: The second sentence is deleted in the Acknowledgements section.*

We thank to you and reviewers for constructive and helpful comments.

Sincerely,  
Dr. Nafiz MADEN