

Response to comments by Topical Editor Charlotte Krawczyk

Thank you for your positive feedback. We addressed all comments as recommended.

1) rev1, comment 1: is that, what you answer in the rebuttal letter said somewhere in the text ? I'd prefer to see a short phrase on this issue, but am not sure where to find it.

I assume it is the following comment by reviewer 2 (as reviewer 1 did not have any comments):

The Authors put a lot of efforts in constraining the hypocenters of AE activity. However, I am puzzled why they did not use the S-waves to improve the location quality? From Figure and the paper itself it is clear the S-waves were efficiently recorded and they could help to constrain the locations. S-phases have been applied in previous studies using similar acquisition system with success (JAGUARS project, ASPO FHF experiment, see appropriate papers). Could you comment on that and also inform the Readers on your choices?

We added the sentence: 'S-wave arrivals were not included in the location, because only few S-wave arrivals could be reliably picked, and the anisotropic S-wave velocity model is not well constrained.' in the methods section (Line 265-266).

2) rev3, comment 10: the disagreement is fine with me.

We are glad you support our argument.

3) rev3, line 329: your rebuttal is not included in the text; please add a statement on this issue, too.

The comment is: "not reached during the break-down cycle". Why? Do you have an explanations? That is Interesting

We added a statement that we do not understand the reason for such a minimum volume threshold to induce seismicity (Line 345-346).