

Authors' Responses to Comments from the Referee 2

Referee #2: The paper clearly expresses the concepts described as objectives, but there are some parts to be improved/modified.

We are encouraged that you agree that our manuscript clearly expresses the concepts described as our objectives in this study. Based on your comments, we revised our manuscript, and believe this revised version is an improvement. We thank you for your helpful suggestions and constructive feedback.

1. In the title it could be better to add a reference related to the importance of the population preparedness about the EEWS, the second pillar of the paper together with the messages' characteristics. It could be something like: "Effective earthquake early warning systems: appropriate messaging and population preparedness roles".

Response: Based on your suggestion, we have revised the title of this manuscript. However, in our study, we found that the main limitation of Sichuan's EEWS was that the public's lack of awareness of the EEWS prevented their understanding of the time-sensitive alert messaging. Since we did not specifically address the broader topic of "public preparedness" in this article but instead the more limited "public awareness" and "education", the new title is: "Effective earthquake early warning systems: Appropriate messaging and public awareness roles".

2. The description of the responders' samples has to be better organized at the beginning of the related paragraph (starting from line 106). As example, it's important to move in this paragraph the sentence written in the note 1, page 7 about the group B, to permit a better understanding of the survey.

Response: Based on your suggestion, we have significantly revised and reorganized the paragraph of the respondent samples (Paragraph 1 on page 6). We added more detailed information about the design and delivery of the Internet-based survey. We reorganized the sentences describing both groups to provide a better understanding of the respondents.

3. Figure 1: add the unit of measure in the legend of fig. 1(a). The caption of the figure is too long. The four regions can be described in paragraph 3, as partially done in line73-75.

Response: We have added the unit of measurement in the legend of fig. 1(a) and shortened the caption of the figure. We have moved the description of the four regions to Lines 73-74.

4. There is a paragraph 3.2 but not a paragraph 3.1

Response: Thanks for pointing out this oversight on our part. We have corrected the number of the paragraph.

5. I agree with the other comments written by the Referee #1 (09 Mar 2021)

Response: We have carefully responded to the specific comments from Referee #1.

6. My comments are strictly related to this paper, and not about the positioning of the paper in the literature about the topic “Earthquake Early Warning Systems”.

Response: We appreciate your helpful comments.

7. A general revision of the language is suggested.

Response: We have carefully proofread the revised manuscript.