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March 23, 2014

Dear Victor Vakaryuk:

Thank your for organizing the third round of review of our manuscript BH12397, “Thermal Conductivity Accumulation in Amorphous Silica and Amorphous Silicon.” We apologize for the errors in our response to Referee Three and we correct them below.

We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

­

Alan McGaughey

**Response to the Second Report of the Third Referee**

Modified text throughout the manuscript is highlighted in red.

*The authors claim that:  
  
1) “The transverse sound speed predicted for our model of a-SiO2 is  
85% of that predicted by the other methods (Table I) and that measured  
by experiment[63,67,70], which is likely related to the smaller  
density of our samples (see Section III A).”  
  
The theoretical a-SiO2 models are actually of higher density than the  
experimental samples.*

This was a mistake in the text. The text has been corrected in Section IV C:

“...which is likely related to the **larger** density of our samples (see Section III A).”

*2) "**Because the predicted kGK for a-Si is lower than kvib (but still  
within the uncertainty), adjusting the propagating mode properties  
towards longitudinal values would only make the agreement with kGK  
worse. As such, we do not feel that the use of Eq. (2) with a single  
polarization is the cause for the difference between kvib and kGK."  
  
Looking at figure 6b, it seems that k\_vib is lower than k\_GK,  
therefore the agreement should improve considering longitudinal modes  
explicitly. Is there a chance that I am misinterpreting fig 6b?*

We apologize for the confusion, the predicted kvib is lower than kGK. The statement should have read:

“Because the predicted kGK for a-Si is **larger** than kvib (but still  
within the uncertainty), adjusting the propagating mode properties  
towards longitudinal values would only make the agreement with kGK  
worse.”

According to the last paragraph of Section IV C:

“Holding all other input parameters in Eq. (1) constant, a smaller sound speed leads to a larger kpr because the DOS scales as 1/vs3. We can thus regard our kpr prediction as an upper bound.”