

Dear Editor:

I quite appreciate your patience and detail oriented on our manuscript entitled “Assessment of liquefaction-induced hazards using Bayesian networks based on standard penetration test data” (No. nhees-2017-80). Those comments about the figures are all valuable and very helpful for revising and improving our manuscript, as well as the important guiding significance to our research. Now, we have made correction exactly according to the editor’s comments, which we hope to meet with approval.

Once again, thank you very much for your comments and suggestions. The main corrections in the paper and response to your comments are as follows:

Yours sincerely,

Xiaowei TANG , Xu BAI, Jilei HU, and Jiangnan QIU

Suggestion for revision:

1. In Figure 5, the dataset used for the case study is shown. However, as the meaning of the x-axe labels can be derived from the text (not from the caption), the individual bar labels can hardly be read and their meanings are sometimes not clear (e.g., GT: what is “deep”, “medium”, “shallow”?) Please accompany the Figure with an appropriate table or similar to let the reader know about the parameter class ranges.

Response: It is very grateful to your suggestion. In previous versions of our manuscript, the authors did not show the specific instruction of the grading standards for the 12 factors. It is not visualized enough to understand them just according to the reference paper behind. We had added a new Table 2 to introduce them in Page 25-26 and corrected the statement in Line 29, Page 7 in the revision. The serial number of tables behind is also changed from 2-7 to 3-8 simultaneously.

2. In addition, Figure 9 should be reworked as the point labels are not readable, sometimes masking the site info. Please check if the labels are really needed, and modify the Figure in such that what is written in the text (Section 5) can easily be verified by the reader.

Response: Figure 9 helps to visualize the assessment results of the severity of hazards. It does not preclude the understanding of Section 5 without figure 9. We delete this figure and the statement about it in Section 5 according to the editor’s comment.

