

05/07/22

The editor,
Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences, Copernicus.

Thank you for providing us with notable remarks. The constructive comments from the special issue editor and reviewers have greatly improved the quality of the manuscript. We addressed the issues raised by the editor as follows:

Editor comments:

The paper has been thoroughly revised by the authors based on the changes proposed by the reviewers. We gave the authors the opportunity to do a major revision, despite the fact that one of the reviewers proposed to reject the paper, and I think that was a good choice, because the authors were able to greatly improve the paper and to address the criticisms raised by the reviewer.

There are still two issues that I would like to see addressed by the authors before publication.

1) although I am not a native English speaker, I have a clear feeling that the English is not as fluent as it should be and that it is not always precise and elegant. I would ask for an effort from the authors to further improve their English, perhaps with the support of a native speaker. The reading of the article would benefit greatly.

Author response: Thank you for raising an important concern. We have now thoroughly corrected manuscript language. Please see attached track changed version.

2) I am not convinced by the conclusions. As often happens, more than conclusions they seem to me a summary for points of the discussion. If possible, I ask for an effort to elaborate a more prospective conclusion, maybe highlighting the importance of the work for seismic hazard. The authors need to remember that NHESS is not a specialist seismic journal, but welcomes a broad community of researchers from other fields who are not familiar with technical aspects of applied seismology. Therefore, it would be appropriate for the conclusions to also address this audience by highlighting the importance of the findings to hazard in general, and reiterating what is new in this work.

Author response: The editor has provided us with very crucial feedback. We also agree on the fact that the conclusions were not really good in the earlier version of the manuscript. In the revised version, we rewrote the conclusions considering suggestions from the editor. We have also interlinked our findings with broad seismic hazard and preparedness perspectives.

We look forward to receiving your feedback.

Sincerely,
Dipendra Gautam
Corresponding author