

Authors' response letter.

We are uploading the revised version of the manuscript. All the changes indicated in the review forum and open discussion have been addressed. Minor changes to the text have been made, after a carefully language revision.

We have slightly changed Figure 2 by enlarging the extent of Figure 2a to include also the Breggia river (mentioned in the text).

We have changed Figure 8 by deleting the areas that were outside the max distance considered for inversion. The previous version had some of these areas erroneously displayed.

As suggested by reviewer 2, we have changed the titles of Section 4 and 5 in order to highlight that the core of the separation between the two sections is the spatial extent of the results and the relative meaning within a regional framework. Section 4 deals with the local evidence at Como downtown and with the age constraints for the observed effects. Section 5, instead, deals with the comparison with other evidence in literature, presents the results of the inversion and postulate some possible locations for the seismogenic source. As a matter of fact, Section 5 needs to both display the results of the inversion and compare those with what is known in literature (a topic that is usually reserved for discussion).

We have added some less constrained comparison and speculations in the Conclusion section, adding some new literature.