Università
degli Studi
della Campania
Luigi Vanvitelli

Dipartimento di
Ingegneria

Dear Editor,

as corresponding author of the Technical Note "*The beneficial role of a natural permeable layer in slope stabilization by drainage trenches*" (hess-2019-637), I'm going to explain **four important changes** related to the same Authors' typing error, requested to the Publisher that need your approval.

Such modifications, indicated as "TS2", "TS3", "TS4" and "TS5" by the Remarks in the last version of proof-reading (received on April, 2nd, 2020) concern the definition of the average efficiency $\bar{E}(t_{90},\Gamma)$ of the draining trenches along the sliding surface Γ. In particular, $\bar{E}(t_{90},\Gamma)$ is equal to the 90% of the highest efficiency value, corresponding to the average steady-state efficiency $\bar{E}(\infty,\Gamma)$. $\bar{E}(\infty,\Gamma)$ could in turn assume values lower than 1, as shown by Figure 2c and Figure 2d.

Therefore, $\bar{E}(t_{90},\Gamma) = 0.90 \cdot \bar{E}(\infty,\Gamma)$ and t_{90} is the time necessary to reach such efficiency value. On the contrary, the current version of the manuscript wrongly reports

$\bar{E}(t_{90},\Gamma)$ = 0.90 (or $\bar{E}(t_{90},\Gamma)$ = 90%).

As a consequence of such unintentional mistake, **we ask your approval** to authorize the Publisher to make the following changes:

[TS2]: $\bar{E}(t,\Gamma) = 0.90$ **should be replaced by** $\bar{E}(t,\Gamma) = 0.90 \cdot \bar{E}(\infty,\Gamma)$

[TS3]: $\bar{E} = 90\%$ **should be replaced by** $\bar{E}(t_{90},\Gamma)$

[TS4]: $\bar{E}(t,\Gamma) = 90\%$ **should be replaced by** $\bar{E}(t,\Gamma) = 90\%$ of the average steady-state efficiency $\bar{E}(\infty,\Gamma)$

[TS5]: $\bar{E}(t,\Gamma) = 90\%$ **should be replaced by** $\bar{E}(t,\Gamma) = 90\%$ of the average steady-state efficiency $\bar{E}(\infty,\Gamma)$

Apologizing for such inconvenience, I hope to have clearly explained the reason of the requested changes.

Best regards.

Napoli, 3 April 2020

Prof. Luca Comegna, corresponding author