

We thank the Anonymous referee #3 for his/her comments and appreciation of our work. We took into consideration the majority of the suggestions, trying as much as possible to balance this review with the previous ones.

Here follows a point-by-point reply (in red) to the referee's comments (in Italic, black).

*Title: The nature of the application should be emphasized, now it appears some generic. I suggest highlighting the contribution of IPE and probabilistic analysis in the proposed approach.*

R: We slightly changed the title to take the suggestion into account.

*Chapter 2 should be partially rewritten, cutting the repeated mere description of the different releases of the catalogues/databases prior to CPTI/DBMI, and focusing on the complex issue of the historical completeness. Some information on its spatial and temporal distribution through Italy from specific historical studies (just some examples), should be given. In this way, the usefulness of the proposed approach will be more evident to the readers.*

R: We agree with the comment and revised Chapter 2 accordingly. We eliminated the parts dealing with previous catalogues and databases and few other minor details on the current versions. We briefly commented (lines 83 of the revised manuscript) regarding historical completeness, although very few specific historical studies do exist for Italy, and recent ones are totally missing.

*Chapter 5 (Results) is the core of the paper and should be better organised. Here some suggestions:*

- *the chapter is structured in a sub-chapter 5.1 reporting all the results, not followed by any other sub-chapters. I don't understand the reason, if so it can be eliminated. Perhaps you missed to insert a sub-chapter 5.2 at line 257, since from this point you presented the exceedance probabilities at the considered localities.*

R: Sub-chapter 5.2 "Geographical distribution of potentially lost effects" is not missing but started at line 228 of the original manuscript. We maintained this subdivision between a site-by-site and a geographical analysis of our results.

- *magnitude of historical earthquakes. At line 194 you indicated the macroseismic magnitude of the 1914 event as Mw 5.24; in the following, you did the same for other historical events. At line 202 you reported the instrumental magnitude of the 2012 mainshock as Mw 5.9. At line 239 you indicated as 7.3 the Mw of the 1693 event. This different usage of the decimals is a non-sense; I read your replay on the on-line comments that the macroseismic magnitude values are taken from CPTI as they stand, but this is a scientific publication and you must adopt the same standard. Please, use one decimal for the macroseismic estimations of Mw, possibly rounding if necessary (6.27=6.3). The important thing is that you declare this in some point of the text.*

R: We rounded all the Mw values at the first decimal digit as suggested.

*Chapter 6 (Discussions and conclusions) is equally important for the paper. However, as it stands I see some repetitions (the main one at lines 280-292, it seems an abstract) and no real critical discussion on the possible implications or explanations of the spatial-temporal features of the historical completeness (except for a few hint). This point deserves to be improved.*

R: We avoided any repetition in the Conclusions and added further details on the pros and cons of the proposed approach, as suggested in the annotated manuscript. We commented on the reasons for the spatial and temporal incompleteness of the intensity data, which may derive from the lack of both local historical documentation and its investigation. As specified in the revised manuscript, any further conclusions would require an in-depth historical analysis which is beyond the scope of this paper and its authors' expertise.

*Other remarks and specific comments are reported in the annotated manuscript.*

R: we took into account the remarks and comments in the annotated manuscript. We answer the main comments in the following:

- We modified the last sentence of the abstract;
- We partially rewrote Section 2 as described above, moving in that Section the part at lines 110-115 of Section 3 of the original manuscript;
- We rephrased and simplified the sentences in Section 4 (lines 157-162 of the original manuscript) to better explain the results shown in Figure 1.
- We rewrote the sentence at line 212 of the original manuscript.
- We commented the seismicity of the Italian area in a new sentence making reference to the Italian Catalogue at lines 252-253 of the revised manuscript;
- We partially rewrote the Discussion and Conclusions part as suggested and described above.