Dear Andrea Billi,

Thank you for in most cases appropriately addressing the last comments. I found three occasions where your response was missing or not accurate, which I write below. I hence suggest technical corrections that need to address three points. Upon including these I do not need to check your manuscript again and it can proceed to the publication process.

I hope you will accept my apologies for the exceptionally long time needed to properly review and guide your paper. In part this was due to an exceptionally busy period upon return from my maternity leave and move to a new permanent position.

Best regards,

Ylona

From that same perspective I think the worries expressed by Valensise as summarized in the centre paragraph on C5 (SC1) should be better articulated in the paper. For example, for assumptions 3 and 4 in section 4.2.

>> Not addressed (see start p. 2)

As a follow-up on comment 17 by Valensise:
I agree lengths in Fig. 7 and 8 seem to represent the required fault length and there are no isolated cells with too large a magnitude
However, in Fig. 9 for the observations I do see quite many of such isolated cells, as I guess these values have ended up only in the cell of the hypocenter. This means that when assessing the difference in Fig. 10,11, and 12 you are also including this missing information and are thus underestimating Mcatalogue and overestimating deltaM.
Dear Editor, we have re-checked Figs. 7 and 8 and we do not see isolated cells characterized by high FLEM values (and therefore by long faults). In particular, we refer to red cells that are never isolated in Figs. 7 and 8. Please, note that cells with lower FLEM values (orange-yellow to blue cells) are characterized by shorter faults and hence can occur also as isolated. In other words, isolated orange-yellow to blue cells are compatible with the used method whereas isolated red cells would be incompatible (they are not isolated indeed) with our method as pointed out by Valensise et alii. We are obviously available for further improvements and clarifications.

>> You have not addressed the key point, which is the second paragraph that refers to Fig. 9, not 7 or 8. I already wrote that I agree with your assessment of Fig. 7 and 8.

- Occasionally (p. 16, l. 15; p.1, l. 14) you still use scaling law instead of scaling relation.
There are no “scaling laws” in our manuscript. We have found three “scaling equations” that have been changed into “scaling relationships” (Lines 16 P. 10; 22 P. 10; 28 P. 10).

>> A simple search does show them at key locations in the manuscript. For example, see p.1, l.1 qand p. 16, l. 25.