

Answer to Donelick

“specific comments”

- page 1, lines 16-17: Thanks!
- page 1, lines 50-51: OK.
- page 3, lines 66-67; page 4, line 84: Yes, it should say “mean track length”, and I will make clear that the intent is to broaden the distribution about L0 in part to the range of track lengths observed in laboratory annealed populations for mean track lengths 6-15 micr. m. I do not like to call them “relatively unannealed populations”.
- page 4, lines 101-102: I agree it is better to write “It is expected that horizontal confined tracks of large area (the product of etched length and width) are more likely to be etched”.
- page 6, Figure 2: I accept Reword “initial length range, biases and uncertainties”. Initial length range due largely to range of 238U (natural) or 235U (induced) fission energies.
- page 11, line 243: I agree on using the word “simplified” instead.
- page 11, lines 241-253: Thanks!
- page 20, Figure D1; page 21, Figure D2; page 23, Figure D4: I accept to replace these figures with polar coordinate plots.

3. Presentation Quality:

- page 1, line 19: Use “titanite” instead of “sphene”, OK.
- page 1, line 48: Replace “counted” with “measured” in “given angle from the horizontal are counted”, OK.