Dr Olga-Joan Ktenidou
Senior researcher
Institute of Geodynamics
National Observatory of Athens
PO Box 20048, 11810, Athens, Greece
olga.ktenidou@noa.gr

Att.: Dr L. Danciu
Guest Editor, Special issue on European Seismic Hazard and Risk models

Athens,
19/12/2024

Dear Editor,

Please find enclosed the revision of our work entitled 'The quest for reference stations at the National Observatory of Athens, Greece'.

We would like to thank the reviewers as well as yourself for the final minor suggestions and comments. In what follows, we describe the changes made to the manuscript. These are also clearly marked on the annotated documents using 'track changes' and the main changes based on reviewer comments are highlighted in yellow.

Thank you again for your time and consideration of our work. We are looking forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely, for the authors,

Olga-Joan Ktenidou

Revisions requested by reviewers (highlighted in yellow in the text):

1. Based on Reviewer #1:
   - "Introduction and dataset" ➔ The 2nd paragraph in page 2 is now reworded, as suggested.
   - "Signal processing" ➔ With thanks for the encouragement and appreciation, we have however removed mention to coda windows because they are not analysed in this paper and discussing their potential differences with S-waves would likely sidetrack us.
   - "Data analysis" ➔ The 1st paragraph in page 15 is now reworded, as suggested.
   - "Clustering and classification" ➔ Section 3.2 referred to by the reviewer is now called 4.2 because we discovered our section numbering was erroneous. The 1st paragraph in page 2 is now reworded, as suggested, and less stress is now placed on defending the lack of ds2s/kappa. Indeed, this long-winded defense was a result of the first review but its effect was distracting.
   - "Discussion" ➔ With thanks for the encouragement and appreciation, we have only made small editorial improvements and clarifications.

2. Based on Reviewer #2:
   - Main remaining comment on VACF: We recognize the point the reviewer is trying to make and the need to stress the tentative nature of the VACF-corrected results. Figure 9 has been moved back to the annex. The 1st paragraph in page 17-18 has been reworked in the same spirit, stressing the assumptions and further describing how VACF was initially computed. See also 1st paragraph in page 20.
   - All 6 minor comments of editorial nature have been implemented (including amending figures 3 and 9), thank you for catching them.

Additional editorial revisions:

We have carefully re-examined the manuscript and made extensive editorial improvements to the language, our main goal being better clarity, simplicity and succinctness, improved grammar and avoiding some repetitions. We also spotted some issues that needed fixing, namely:

- Our section numbering had errors and repetitions and was fixed.
- Table 1 was lacking its first 2 columns by mistake. This was fixed.
- Figure 4 and 8 were lacking a legend to explain angles of rotation – fixed.
- Figure 9 has more comprehensible data labels.
- A reference was added for the Ward criterion.
- Corrected some affiliations.