

1. Does the paper address relevant scientific and/or technical questions within the scope of NHESS? Yes
2. Does the paper present new data and/or novel concepts, ideas, tools, methods or results? Yes
3. Are these up to international standards? Potentially yes.
4. Are the scientific methods and assumptions valid and outlined clearly? No, see written comments
5. Are the results sufficient to support the interpretations and the conclusions? No, see written comments
6. Does the author reach substantial conclusions? Conclusions will need to be rethought, pending revision of the paper.
7. Is the description of the data used, the methods used, the experiments and calculations made, and the results obtained sufficiently complete and accurate to allow their reproduction by fellow scientists (traceability of results)? Yes.
8. Does the title clearly and unambiguously reflect the contents of the paper? More or less. Could be stronger.
9. Does the abstract provide a concise, complete and unambiguous summary of the work done and the results obtained? Could be written better and more focused. First two sentences are superfluous.
10. Are the title and the abstract pertinent, and easy to understand to a wide and diversified audience? Yes
11. Are mathematical formulae, symbols, abbreviations and units correctly defined and used? If the formulae, symbols or abbreviations are numerous, are there tables or appendixes listing them? NA
12. Is the size, quality and readability of each figure adequate to the type and quantity of data presented? No, font on Fig 10B is far too small.
13. Does the author give proper credit to previous and/or related work, and does he/she indicate clearly his/her own contribution? Yes to previous/related work. The contribution breakdown is not provided.
14. Are the number and quality of the references appropriate? Yes
15. Are the references accessible by fellow scientists? Yes
16. Is the overall presentation well structured, clear and easy to understand by a wide and general audience? Parts need to be reorganized. See written comments.
17. Is the length of the paper adequate, too long or too short? Some parts seem too short. See annotated comments.
18. Is there any part of the paper (title, abstract, main text, formulae, symbols, figures and their captions, tables, list of references, appendixes) that needs to be clarified, reduced, added, combined, or eliminated? Yes, the proxy used to identify sediment layers attributed to seismic events needs to be presented more strongly. This requires assessing it against both notable historic earthquake events and other plausible aseismic mechanisms, such as major flood events. See written comments.
19. Is the technical language precise and understandable by fellow scientists? Yes

20. Is the English language of good quality, fluent, simple and easy to read and understand by a wide and diversified audience? Can be improved (in places wordy, incorrect word choices, etc.). See annotations.
21. Is the amount and quality of supplementary material (if any) appropriate? Some key material needs to be moved from supplementary material to paper. See written comments.