Dear Professor Rajaram,

Thank you for your email. While the outcome of the review is regrettable, we very much appreciate the enclosed reviews; they have given us more to think about.

Pertaining to the review from Reviewer 1, we find the feedback to be very thought-provoking and would like to address the key issues raised:

1. Issue of novelty: As you pointed out, greater detail is required in the manuscript. Admittedly, we did not adequately delineate our work from previous approaches. In particular, we should emphasize that we are focusing on fractured porous media where flow occurs in both fractures and host rock at different timescales. This is different from the case of flow in a fractured but impermeable media, which the reviewer drew many concepts from in his/her feedback. We have updated our manuscript to highlight this better (Lines 51-110 in ‘Updated Manuscript.pdf’).
2. Lack of sufficient detail: The reviewer pointed out correctly that the Effective Medium Theory (EMT) was poorly defined in the manuscript. We are glad to improve on this (Lines 171-186 and 267-274 in ‘Updated Manuscript.pdf’).
3. Problematic assumption: The reviewer challenged our use of a linear relationship between fracture size and aperture and suggested that randomly assigning apertures will likely lead to different results. While we did not consider this exact approach, we previously did case study with constant apertures and reached the same findings as our other studies. We chose not to include this in the manuscript as we felt that a de-correlated aperture-size relationship is unrealistic. Instead, we provided two extra case studies with square and square root relationships to show that the findings are undisturbed by the choice of correlation. We are glad to amend the manuscript to include the constant aperture case study. Please see ‘Case 14.docx’ for the results of this case study.

In consideration of the additional elaboration and case study provided, we are hoping that you might revisit your decision to decline our manuscript.

Finally, while reviewer 2 did not provide any critical remarks, we appreciate his/her accurate summary of our work as well as his/her endorsement of the manuscript.

Regards,

Daniel