REPLY TO REVIEWER 1

In this document, we have replied to comments on our *Solid Earth* Discussion article *'A systems-based systems-based approach to parameterise seismic hazard in regions with little historical or instrumental seismicity: The South Malawi Active Fault Database'* (SE-2020-104) by Reviewer 1 (Richard Styron). In italics are the reviewer's comments, which have been copied from the original review, and in blue cambria text are our replies to them with how we would like to incorporate them into a revised manuscript to submit to *Solid Earth*.

Kind regards
Jack Williams (on behalf of all coauthor's)

The paper by Williams et al. provides a high-quality map of active faults in southern Malawi, and presents a clever method for partitioning regional deformation rates onto the rift structures, with a thorough exploration of the uncertainties. The work (the mapping, rate estimation, and manuscript) are executed competently, and there is nothing that is strictly incorrect, although some topics would benefit from a bit more explanation if not revision. The mapping is quite high quality, and is the most solid contribution made here.

Although the authors may not want to do this, I think that the work could benefit from being split into two different, shorter papers: one that presents the fault mapping and discusses it in a bit more detail and context (although not too much more), and another that presents the parameter estimates, ideally as a part of a PSHA. (Note that I am not asking that this be done for major revisions–it's just something to consider doing.)

We thank the reviewer for their suggestion, which we have considered very seriously. Our preference is to keep the mapping and parameter estimates together in one paper, as we feel they are inherently linked and that a strength of the current study is the fact that it spans traditional discipline boundaries, Nevertheless, we see the importance of more distinctly separating between our observations and interpretations. As outlined below with respect to major issue #1, we will do this by providing two distinct GIS file databases, the 'South Malawi Active Fault Database' and 'South Malawi Seismogenic Sources Database'. In this way, the reader will be more able to separate between the fault mapping and the parameter estimates, and any user has a choice between adapting the fault mapping only or also including our parameter estimates.

Major issues:

1. ***Separation of data and estimates***

The first issue is that there is no apparent separation in the fault data and attributes between observation (and associated interpretation firmly based in observations) and rough estimation based on little to no data. Although the authors are helpfully conforming to the schema laid out by the GEM Faulted Earth (GFE) project (e.g. Christophersen et al. 2015), I believe that the GFE is intended to hold observations or measurements, rather than the estimates made in this project. For example, recurrence intervals would be derived from paleoseismology rather than calculated from the slip rate and assumed magnitudes. Only considering measured recurrence intervals makes the recurrence intervals independent of assumptions of earthquake magnitude, scaling relations, or other factors. Christophersen et al (2015) state that the database is often sparse where observations don't exist.

The coupling of the fault traces (which are observations or data, as far as I am concerned, even if there is an interpretive component) with the parameter estimations crosses a traditional boundary. Typically, the fault data are considered to be somewhat objective and immutable (though subject to

revision) while the derivation of earthquake rates is considered to be part of the modeling process and often done while making fault sources for a PSHA. Model results are a bit more subjective and mutable, as they are dependent on assumptions that are explored during the modeling process and/or are project-dependent. A good modeler will have a process for testing and refining some of these assumptions (i.e. magnitude scaling relations or slip partitioning) through comparisons with instrumental seismicity or other observations. However the observed data are usually not revised to improve a data-model fit. A user who wants to incorporate this dataset into a seismic hazard model, but who may not agree with some of the model assumptions used here (i.e. scaling relations, magnitude ranges, or the style of partitioning between internal and border faults) may have a hard time knowing what to keep and what to discard, without reading a long paper. This can be a big challenge for the many seismic hazard modelers who do not have a great facility with the English language. Similarly, if this data were incorporated into other fault databases, the end user may not be able to cleanly separate data from model results.

This does not mean that what the authors have done is wrong or necessarily needs to be changed. It is just to raise their awareness of a potential concern (that these estimates may be confused for observations) and that many hazard modelers would prefer to redo the estimation rather than rely on these results. I am not sure of the best course of action. If it were me doing the work, I would separate these processes and release both 'only data' and 'data plus estimates' datasets. I would also consider publishing them independently, and perhaps incorporating the rate estimation work into a PSHA rather than going part way as is done here. But there is no 'right' or scientifically optimal decision here, and a lot depends on the particular circumstances of the authors.

Another possibility is to keep the parameter estimation through the slip rate estimation but stop there, which would avoid the problems of choosing a magnitude-frequency distribution, estimating the seismogenic thickness of the crust, etc. In a typical project, these tasks are often done by the hazard modeler rather than the geologist who prepares the fault data up through slip rate estimations.
I can state that as a fault data compiler, I am a bit hesitant to bring any of the estimated parameters into the GEM Global Active Faults Database, as they are too poorly constrained and data-limited, and I don't want users to confuse them for measurements.

As noted above, to follow the advice to release both 'only data' and 'data plus estimates' datasets, we propose that in the resubmitted manuscript we will describe and include two separate GIS databases of faults in South Malawi:

1. The South Malawi Active Fault Database (SMAFD): this database will incorporate the objective mapping and geomorphic 'trace' attributes included in the current version of the SMAFD. In addition, individual GIS features will represent faults (see minor comment for Line 325). In this way, the SMAFD will conform to the 'only data' dataset requested by the reviewer and will also be readily comparable to the newly published GEM Global Active Fault Database (Styron and Pagani, 2020).
2. The South Malawi Seismogenic Source Database (SMSSD): this database will incorporate the modelling derived attributes included in the original version of the SMAFD that are required to turn the mapped faults into earthquake sources for PSHA (e.g. fault segmentation, fault width, slip rates, earthquake magnitudes, and recurrence intervals). Here, individual GIS features will represent fault segments that can each be considered distinct sources for PSHA. Furthermore, in line with other earthquake source databases (Basili et al., 2008; Field et al., 2014; Stirling et al., 2012) faults in the SMSSD will be mapped as straight lines that connect segment tips, as opposed to truly honouring the surface trace of the faults (see for example the comparison for the Chingale Step Fault in Figure 4b of the discussion manuscript). In this way, the SMSSD will conform to the 'data plus estimate' dataset requested by the reviewer.

By distinctly describing these two datasets in the revised manuscript, whilst also clearly outlining how they are linked, we will thus address the reviewer's concern about how users of these databases may be confused by which fault attributes are objective measurements, and which are model-driven. Furthermore, we will maintain the multidisciplinary aspect of this manuscript, and allow seismic hazard modellers to understand the limitations for geologists investigating active faults in a region where data is sparse and vice versa. Work to include the SMAFD and SMSSD into PSHA in southern Malawi is ongoing, and this will be the topic of a subsequent study.

2. ***Estimation of uncertainty:***

The second issue is that the logic tree framework used to propagate uncertainties and explore the parameter space is perhaps more complex than it needs to be based on the lack of input data. It is a clever method and there seems to be nothing incorrect in the implementation, but I question the wisdom of using it southern Malawi where there is essentially no data to feed in. The old saying in modeling is "garbage in, garbage out"; in this case it's more like "nothing in, nothing out" (I am not suggesting the work is garbage!). The exercise seems to simply quantify the obvious, that each fault slips somewhere between 0-5 mm/yr. I am not sure that it provides much value. The further work, estimating recurrence intervals, has larger theoretical issues (discussed below) in addition to adding several more layers of uncertainty into the results. It could easily be removed from the database (though perhaps kept in the paper for discussion).

As a subordinate issue, I don't think a logic tree framework is really the most appropriate method of propagating uncertainty as used; it is more appropriate when the parameters that make up the branches in the tree are discrete variables with a few choices, rather than continuous random variables. For example, an appropriate use of logic trees is to consider different scaling relationships.

With continuous random variables (i.e., extension rate or dip), the use of unweighted logic trees considers the lower, mid, and high values to all have equal probability. Do the authors consider this to be the case? Do the authors believe that the resulting low, mid and high values are equally probable? Even if the inputs are all equal, if there are no correlations between the different parameters, the middle values should be more probable (see for example the Central Limit Theorem).

In my opinion, a more appropriate method for representing the uncertainty in the results (i.e., slip rates or recurrence intervals) would be to define distributions for each continuous random variable (i.e., dip or total geodetic extension at that latitude) and then randomly sample from these distributions, and then characterize the resulting distributions for the results parameters. This is a simple Monte Carlo method. The major strength of this method is that the sampling will cover far more of the parameter space than a coarse 'low/med/high' sampling method. It is also quite trivial to introduce distributions for each parameter that may reflect prior knowledge (i.e., a PDF of regional dips based on focal mechansisms or structural measurements).

One way to think of this is that the representation of uncertainty in the model should reflect the real uncertainty of the parameter. Continuous variables should be represented through continuous distributions, while discrete variables (i.e. the choice of scaling relationships) should be represented through discrete distributions (i.e. lists or arrays, perhaps weighted).

The strategy employed here does a good job of defining the absolute range of the results based on the inputs, but a worse job of defining the central values (broadly like the mean and one standard deviation rather than three standard deviations). If the authors believe this is the better choice, that is fine, but I would like to hear their arguments.

We can appreciate why the reviewer might question the usefulness of the large uncertainties in our slip rate and recurrence intervals estimates. However, the fact remains that even being able to quantify slip rate estimates of 0-5 mm/yr in southern Malawi represents a significant advance, given that prior to this study, no slip rate estimates have been previously made. Furthermore, as highlighted in the manuscript (Lines 732-741) the large range of values we obtain in our recurrence interval estimates are not unusual compared to other low strain rate regions with limited paleoseismic information (Villamor et al., 2018) and can still be incorporated into PSHA (Hodge et al., 2015). Indeed, these large ranges can be considered as an important outcome of the study, as they can be used to the highlight the parameters that need further study to reduce uncertainty (Sect. 5.3 of discussion manuscript).

We note that logic trees have been used elsewhere to propagate uncertainty in seismic hazard in regions with little paleoseismic data (Villamor et al., 2018). However, we do agree with the reviewer's comments on how we should consider our lower, intermediate, and upper estimates; indeed, we noted in the discussion manuscript that the upper and lower values obtained from the logic tree required an unlikely set of parameter combinations (Lines 589-592), and that treating these values as a continuous variable and assigning a probability distribution function to them would be a more appropriate method of treating them in PSHA (lines 797-801).

A more complex treatment than the intermediate, lower, and upper slip rate and recurrence interval estimates obtained from the logic tree are beyond the scope of this study, but already under consideration for our next paper. In the resubmitted manuscript, we propose that we would have a distinct section on how the fault data included in the SMAFD and SMSSD could be incorporated into PSHA, where we can more explicitly discuss some of the reviewer's excellent suggestions. This would also address Major Issue #3 (see below).

3. ***The calculations of recurrence rate:***

The authors choose to calculate recurrence rates under the assumption that all of the seismic moment that accumulates on each fault is released during earthquakes of identical magnitude. This is essentially the "characteristic earthquake hypothesis" which featured quite prominently in mid-late 20th century paleoseismology and PSHA but was always quite contentious (for example see "Characteristic Earthquake Model, 1884-2011, RIP" by Kagan et al. 2012, Seismological Research Letters). This hypothesis is believed by fewer and fewer scientists with each passing year, as our observations of variable rupture segmentation and per-event displacement accrue. The few remaining national-level PSHA models that still use a 'pure' characteristic earthquake model (not a distribution that includes aleatoric variability) do so primarily because it simplifies time-dependent hazard analysis. The modern state of practice is to consider a range of earthquake sizes on each fault, and to distribute moment throughout the range of earthquake sizes by specifying the relative frequencies of different magnitudes of earthquakes, and then calculating the absolute frequencies through moment rate balancing.

The canonical reference for this is Youngs and Coppersmith (1985 BSSA), which provides equations for multiple magnitude-frequency distributions. GEM's Open-Quake Engine and OQ Model Building Toolkit also has some Python code for this purpose, if the authors are interested in using or studying a functional implementation (https://github.com/gem/oq-engine/tree/master/openquake/hazardlib/mfd; https://github.com/GEMScienceTools/oqmbtk/blob/master/openquake/mbt/tools/fault_modeler/fault_modeling_utils.py#L2379). If the authors favor the pure characteristic earthquake hypothesis, then they should provide some supporting arguments. Otherwise they may either calibrate the magnitude frequency distributions, or simply drop this part of the estimation procedure (even if they retain the estimates up through the slip rate calculations).

We recognise that we make a large simplification by considering characteristic whole-fault or segment ruptures only, and that fully incorporating the SMAFD into PSHA requires further evaluation of individual faults' magnitude-frequency distribution. We will ensure that this simplification is clearly spelled out in a revision, but also note that by considering both whole fault or segmented fault ruptures, our study already partially recognises that the characteristic earthquake hypothesis does not necessarily apply in southern Malawi, because the faults will not always host similar sized events. Furthermore, some recent studies have noted that the characteristic earthquake hypothesis, and its use in PSHA, is not necessarily 'dead' (Stirling and Gerstenberger, 2018).

It is also worth reflecting that in studies where faults are allowed to host a range of earthquake magnitudes in PSHA, these are built from many years of detailed geological mapping, historical, instrumental and paleo-, seismicity data, and hazard modelling (Basili et al., 2008; Field et al., 2014). Conversely, prior to this study, there has been very little systematic investigation of possible earthquake magnitudes and recurrence intervals at all in southern Malawi. Hodge et al., (2015) is an exception, and this was based on a very limited active fault mapping. So even though the recurrence interval and earthquake magnitude estimates in this study are poorly constrained compared to other countries' seismic hazard assessments, we still consider them to represent a step change in our understanding of southern Malawi's seismic hazard.

Therefore, similar to Major Issue #2 above, our preference is to incorporate the reviewer's comments in a distinct section where we discuss how this study could be used into PSHA.

Minor issues:

Data license, distribution and updates:

One of the promises of 21st century science is that new technologies enable rapid and low-friction sharing, integrating, and updating of data. However, it raises some new topics that have been heretofore ignored by most. The first is the license of the data. As the creators of a nice dataset, the authors are entitled to specify the terms and conditions under which others may use it. A good "open-data" choice is the Creative Commons Attribution license, which is what the articles published by the EGU/Copernicusjournals use.

However, the authors may wish to specify a different license, such as a non-commercial license (meaning that it can't be sold or used for other commercial purposes), a share-alike license (meaning that any modifications to the data, which are allowed by the Creative Commons licenses, must be redistributed under the same conditions), or various others. There are also more and less restrictive licenses, but these may start to conflict a bit with the release of the data in this journal.

It may sound like a bit of boring lawyer stuff, but it's very important to many of us that deal with others' data regularly. If the authors want the data to be most useful, please explicitly state what the license is, so the potential users can have some clarity about what they can or can't do with it. It's an easy process: just put a 'license.txt' file in the zip with the GIS data.

Similarly, the data will probably see a lot more use if it is easy to get to, and in a place where it's easy for the authors to update. The easiest here is using GitHub (github.com) which has turned into the default small data distribution channel for many, including the GEM Global Active Faults Database. GitHub, or other similar services such as GitLab, provide a great platform for licensing, distributing and updating data, in a way that makes the history of the data transparent to the users by being integrated with a version control system.

Something else to consider is whether the authors would welcome updates or extensions to the mapping (and perhaps parameter estimation). It may be that other users who are interested or have some need for a fault database over a wider area than just that covered in this dataset, and may want to expand along strike. This is the kind of collaborative science that is quite easy to do now, especially with services such as GitHub, but I don't think the academic publication process, and allotment of credit (citationsetc.) has caught up. Nevertheless, if the authors support this (in principle, no need to blindly accept changes) they could write a sentence or two in the manuscript or in a text file with the data describing this.

We recognise the importance of findable, accessible, interoperable, and reusable data (i.e. the FAIR principles), and thank the reviewer for their advice. Indeed, it is these principles that partly guided our decision to submit this study to *Solid Earth*. As the reviewer recommends, when resubmitting the SMAFD and SMSSD, we will be explicit that this will be licenced under Creative Commons (CC-BY-4.0) Licence (in keeping with the GEM Global Fault Active Database).

Publication of code to perform parameter estimation:

I think that by default, any code used in a scientific work should be published with the paper. This would definitely include any code used to perform the parameter estimation (one assumes it wasn't done on a hand calculator). There may be some extenuating circumstances where publication of code isn't a good idea, but this would involve prior intellectual property restrictions or something. I wouldn't consider messy scripts to be exempted here. Detailed inspection of methods and reproducibility is central to the scientific process, and code is perhaps the most perfect form of scientific inquiry thatallows for this. Please publish the code, even if it's a messy script of zip file of them. (Ialso think that EGU/Copernicus asks for this but I could be wrong.)

As outlined above with respect to sharing our GIS file, we appreciate the importance of data that follows the FAIR principle. In this case we will include the excel file where our earthquake source estimates are calculated with our resubmitted file.

Line edits:

Line 5 (and throughout manuscript): Superscripts are formatted as subscripts. This is particularly annoying with exponents.

This was a formatting error when converting the word document to a pdf file, and will of course be corrected in the typeset version of the manuscript

Line 18: All seismically active areas on earth have instrumental records much shorter than the 'repeat times' of the larger earthquake produced in these regions (hundreds to tens of thousands of years).

We recognise that the phrasing of this sentence was not precise. The reviewer is correct in what they say, but we would argue that this problem is particularly acute in low strain rate regions where earthquake recurrence intervals may be ~10,000-100,000 years (i.e. the ~100 year long instrumental record covers 0.1-1% of a fault's seismic cycle). as opposed to 100-1000's of years in high strain rate regions (where the instrumental record covers 10-100% of a fault's seismic cycle). We will revise this sentence to reflect this.

Line 56: Actually, active fault databases have been developed for close to all seismically active regions; the GEM Global Active Faults database is referenced elsewhere in the paper, which has global coverage. Some areas (like the EARS) need better mapping and slip rate measurements, but active fault data does exist.

We will correct for this in our revised submission, but as the reviewer acknowledges, emphasis that though there is global coverage of active fault maps, the mapping in many regions, including Africa is still patchy, and many of the underlying attributes required to use these faults in PSHA is still lacking.

Line 79 (and elsewhere): I would be more careful with the suggestions that PSHA based on instrumental seismicity is likely to underestimate seismicity in moderately low strain rate regions. The cited references don't do a good job of backing this assertion up, which is not surprising as many earthquake scientists who are not actively involved in PSHA overestimate their knowledge of it (Stein being a prime offender). The justification that this study will provide better constraints on earthquake rates than PSHA models that incorporate instrumental seismicity (which, when done correctly, is quite capable of dealing with incomplete catalogs) is cringe-inducing in light of the extremely poor constraints on earthquake rates produced in this work.

The reviewer makes excellent points, and we did not wish to assert that instrumental data provide less constraint than our estimates or that corrections cannot be made to incorporate incomplete catalogs in PSHA. We will therefore clarify and be more careful with our wording in a revised manuscript. In particular, we will more specifically relate it to the EARS, where, to compensate for the incomplete instrumental catalogue, the maximum possible earthquake within each source zone (Mmax) is calculated as the magnitude of the largest event across the entire EAR Western Branch (the 1910 M7.4 Rukwa Earthquake) + 0.5 (Poggi et al., 2017). However, we would suggest that fault mapping in the SMAFD provides much robust constrains on this important parameter.

There are two other points that we also wish to make clearer on the advantage of adding geological and geodetic constraints to hazard models based on instrumental data in Malawi.

Firstly, in the context of the Malawi, if the moment rate from the most complete instrumental record for Malawi (Poggi et al., 2017) is converted to a strain rate using a Kostrov Summation (following the methods outlined in Kostrov, (1974) and Molnar, (1979), a seismogenic crustal thickness of 35 km and faults dipping 53°), the resulting strain rate ($1.4*10^{-9}$ s^{-1}) is less than the strain rate from geodesy ($5\text{-}10*10^{-9}$ s^{-1}; Stamps et al., 2018) by a factor of > 3. Indeed, in a study specific to northern Malawi, the moment release estimated from geodesy is >25x greater than the moment rate from seismology (Ebinger et al., 2019). Of course, some of this strain could be accommodated aseismically, but there is little evidence that this is the case in Malawi (lines 622-627 in the discussion paper). Hence, at least in the EARS, the point remains that incomplete seismicity catalogues may underestimate the seismic hazard. In the revised manuscript, we will provide more details of these moment rate comparisons.

Secondly, the source zones in the PSHA study of Poggi et al., (2017) covers the Rukwa and Malawi Rifts, and so the seismic hazard (in terms of Peak Ground Acceleration) is essentially uniform across a ~300,000 km^2 area. It therefore neglects the observation that the strain (and hence seismic hazard) in this part of the rift is likely to be highest around its border faults (Accardo et al., 2018; Shillington et al., 2020; Wedmore et al., 2020) or that the strain rate increases from south to north along this section of the EAR (Saria et al., 2014).

Of course, the instrumental catalogue is a still a very point source of information for characterising seismic hazard, and the most robust PSHA should consider all these sources of information. In the revised submitted fault map manuscript, we will more carefully outline these points.

Line 160: The GEM Global Active Faults Database has now been through peer review, and the citation should be changed to Styron, Richard, and Marco Pagani. "The GEM Global Active Faults Database." Earthquake Spectra, Aug. 2020, doi:10.1177/8755293020944182.

We will update this reference in the revised manuscript.

Line 324: Note that the GEM neotectonics database is part of the GEM Faulted Earth project, which ended around 2015, and is quite distinct from the GEM Global Active Faults Database (Styron and Pagani, 2020). Please more explicitly refer to the earlier neotectonics database as the Faulted Earth database for clarity.

We thank the reviewer for clarifying the distinction between the GEM Faulted Earth Project and the GEM Global Active Faults Database, and in the revised manuscript will carefully distinguish between these projects.

Line 325: It is worth noting (but not necessarily changing the fault data or the manuscript) that the hierarchy developed by Christophersen et al (2015) as part of the GFE is a bit contentious and has been abandoned at GEM. The newer Global Active Faults database does not incorporate it, as I decided it was too cumbersome and instead chose a 'flat' system where the 'trace' units in the GFE system would be mapped as a single, continuous trace (in most cases it's somewhat obvious that the traces connect in the bedrock regardless of surface expression, as most faults in these databases have a kilometer or more displacement which can't geologically drop to zero where the traces don't quite join). This simplifies the mapping, drastically reduces the file size of the fault database, and makes for easier hazard modeling as the maximum earthquake can be calculated from the area of a single feature rather than manual joining of multiple features. Many other institutions, such as the USGS, are considering following suit if they have not done so already–the simplicity of the system allows for easier updates and more automated pipelines for incorporating faults into PSHA.

It is our intention that the fault databases we produce are as consistent with the GEM Global Active Fault database as possible. Therefore, in the revised manuscript we will revise the South Malawi Active Fault Database (SMAFD) data-only GIS file so that each fault is a single GIS 'feature' (though as outlined for our response to Major Comment #1, individual faults can consist of multiple GIS features in the seismogenic source database, SMSSD)

Line 383: The calculations here are another instance of what many would consider to be modeling decisions rather than something incorporated directly into fault databases.

As outlined for Major Comment #1, by more clearly distinguishing between our observations and modelling parameters, we will address this comment. In this case, by placing fault width as a parameter in the data + estimates SMSSD, but not the data-only SMAFD.

Line 639: This is not in any way a test of the results. The comparison of very broadly estimated rates with data-based estimates for faults hundreds of kilometers away does not meaningfully indicate the validity of the rate estimates here.

We recognise our use of the term 'test' here was misguided but consider this a meaningful 'comparison.' Though these estimates are 100's of km away from southern Malawi, the tectonic setting (i.e. amagmatic continental rift with border faults and intrabasinal faults). and extension rates (1-2 mm/yr; Saria et al., 2014) between these two regions are comparable. In the revised manuscript, we would therefore omit the use of 'test,' and more explicitly justify why this is a meaningful comparison.

Furthermore, we would also argue that when taking a heavily model dependent approach to estimate slip rates and seismic hazard, any 'real-world' constraints that can support our approach, even within an order of magnitude, are useful; it would be worrying, for example, if the intrabasinal faults in northern Malawi had slip rates of <0.01 or >1 mm/yr.

Line 651: This is also not a very meaningful comparison. The reasons that the projected date of initiation of the rifting derived from geodetic data (an extrapolation of 1,000,000x) don't match geologic data are manifold to the point where it may not be worth discussing; consider removing this paragraph.

Unlike the comparison above which deals with fault slip rates measured over 75 Ka, we recognise this comparison is much more uncertain and dependent on several poorly constrained parameters. We will remove it in the revised manuscript.

Line 669: Why exactly are only half of the 128 parameter combinations considered in this? How were these 'carefully selected' in a way that is not cherry picking? Computers re pretty fast these days and if this analysis is worth doing (it is interesting it is worth doing with all of the combinations. Surely it wouldn't take more than a few seconds.

As described fully in Appendix B, these combinations are not 'cherry-picked' but selected based on a rigorous statistical analysis (Box et al., 1978; Rabinowitz and Steinberg, 1991) such that they provide comparable results to an exploration of all the parameter space. We will clarify this in the main text of the revised manuscript.

Lines 691-730: I don't think these bits of discussion add anything to the paper, and removing them would improve the focus of the paper. The digression about fault growth is interesting but not very relevant. The second paragraph has some sloppy scholarship; the 30-60 km long normal faults here are not at all on the long side of normal faults worldwide, as is clearly evident in the GEM Global Active Faults Database which is cited a few times. The Jackson and White reference is very out of date.

We accept the reviewer's comments that this section (Section 6.1 of the discussion paper) detracts from the main focus of the study, and so will remove it from the resubmitted manuscript. This will also create space for further discussion on incorporating the databases into PSHA, without lengthening the paper.

The paragraph on seismic risk is important but could be tightened up and placed in the introduction, where it is more appropriate. The next paragraph, comparing the lengths of faults in this database to earthquakes also suffers a bit because it compares a small number of global earthquakes to a local fault database, which isn't a good point of comparison (longer normal faults exist in several orogens and generally have similarly slow slip rates, i.e. the Basin and Range in the US).

As requested by the reviewer, in the resubmitted manuscript we will revise a comparison of fault lengths in Malawi to those of other normal faults from the Global Earthquake Model Global Active Fault Database (Styron and Pagani, 2020), as opposed to specifically just normal fault earthquake ruptures.

Line 758: This paragraph is troubling. It seems to discourage others from attempting to collect real data to use in PSHA, though there is no reason to think that the rough estimates provided in this work are superior to field measurements.

It was certainly never our intention to discourage the collection of on-fault data to feed into active fault databases, albeit such data still carries large uncertainties, particularly in low strain rate regions such as Malawi (as outlined at Lines 767-769). In the revised manuscript, we will emphasise that our approach is most appropriate in places like southern Malawi precisely because there is currently no paleoseismic data. Furthermore, a motivation of this study was to identify where future data collection should be targeted, with the collection of paleoseismic data clearly highlighted, along with tighter geodetic constraints, as a priority area.

Line 798: The probability distributions listed here describe aleatory variability in recurence, but the topic under discussion is epistemic uncertainty. In this case these are not comparable.

We will correct this statement in the revised manuscript, where there will be a distinct section on incorporating the SMAFD/SMSSD into PSHA.

References

- Accardo, N. J., Shillington, D. J., Gaherty, J. B., Scholz, C. A., Nyblade, A. A., Chindandali, P. R. N., Kamihanda, G., McCartney, T., Wood, D. and Wambura Ferdinand, R.: Constraints on Rift Basin Structure and Border Fault Growth in the Northern Malawi Rift From 3-D Seismic Refraction Imaging, J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth, 123(11), 10,003-10,025, doi:10.1029/2018JB016504, 2018.
- Basili, R., Valensise, G., Vannoli, P., Burrato, P., Fracassi, U., Mariano, S., Tiberti, M. M. and Boschi, E.: The Database of Individual Seismogenic Sources (DISS), version 3: Summarizing 20 years of research on Italy's earthquake geology, Tectonophysics, 453(1–4), 20–43, doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2007.04.014, 2008.
- Box, G. E. P., Hunter, W. G. and Hunter, J. S.: Statistics for experimenters, John Wiley and sons New York., 1978.
- Ebinger, C. J., Oliva, S. J., Pham, T. Q., Peterson, K., Chindandali, P., Illsley-Kemp, F., Drooff, C., Shillington, D. J., Accardo, N. J., Gallacher, R. J., Gaherty, J., Nyblade, A. A. and Mulibo, G.: Kinematics of Active Deformation in the Malawi Rift and Rungwe Volcanic Province, Africa, Geochemistry, Geophys. Geosystems, 20(8), 3928–3951, doi:10.1029/2019GC008354, 2019.
- Field, E. H., Arrowsmith, R. J., Biasi, G. P., Bird, P., Dawson, T. E., Felzer, K. R., Jackson, D. D., Johnson, K. M., Jordan, T. H. and Madden, C.: Uniform California earthquake rupture forecast, version 3 (UCERF3)—The time-independent model, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am., 104(3), 1122–1180, 2014.
- Hodge, M., Biggs, J., Goda, K. and Aspinall, W.: Assessing infrequent large earthquakes using geomorphology and geodesy: the Malawi Rift, Nat. Hazards, 76(3), 1781–1806, doi:10.1007/s11069-014-1572-y, 2015.
- Kostrov, V. V: Seismic moment and energy of earthquakes, and seismic flow of rock, Izv. Acad. Sci. USSR Phys. Solid Earth, Engl. Transl., 1, 23–44, 1974.
- Molnar, P.: Earthquake recurrence intervals and plate tectonics, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am., 69(1), 115–133, 1979.
- Poggi, V., Durrheim, R., Tuluka, G. M., Weatherill, G., Gee, R., Pagani, M., Nyblade, A. and Delvaux, D.: Assessing seismic hazard of the East African Rift: a pilot study from GEM and AfricaArray, Bull. Earthq. Eng., 1–31, doi:10.1007/s10518-017-0152-4, 2017.
- Rabinowitz, N. and Steinberg, D. M.: Seismic hazard sensitivity analysis: a multi-parameter approach, Bull. - Seismol. Soc. Am., 81(3), 796–817, 1991.
- Saria, E., Calais, E., Stamps, D. S., Delvaux, D. and Hartnady, C. J. H.: Present-day kinematics of the East African Rift, J. Geophys. Res. Solid Earth, 119(4), 3584–3600, doi:10.1002/2013JB010901, 2014.
- Shillington, D. J., Scholz, C. A., Chindandali, P. R. N., Gaherty, J. B., Accardo, N. J., Onyango, E., Ebinger, C. J. and Nyblade, A. A.: Controls on Rift Faulting in the North Basin of the Malawi (Nyasa) Rift, East Africa, Tectonics, 39(3), e2019TC005633, doi:10.1029/2019TC005633, 2020.
- Stamps, D. S., Saria, E. and Kreemer, C.: A Geodetic Strain Rate Model for the East African Rift System, Sci. Rep., 8(1), doi:10.1038/s41598-017-19097-w, 2018.
- Stirling, M. and Gerstenberger, M.: Applicability of the Gutenberg-Richter relation for major active faults in New Zealand, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am., 108(2), 718–728, doi:10.1785/0120160257, 2018.
- Stirling, M., McVerry, G., Gerstenberger, M., Litchfield, N., Van Dissen, R., Berryman, K., Barnes, P., Wallace, L., Villamor, P., Langridge, R., Lamarche, G., Nodder, S., Reyners, M.,

Bradley, B., Rhoades, D., Smith, W., Nicol, A., Pettinga, J., Clark, K. and Jacobs, K.: National seismic hazard model for New Zealand: 2010 update, Bull. Seismol. Soc. Am., 102(4), 1514–1542, doi:10.1785/0120110170, 2012.

- Styron, R. and Pagani, M.: The GEM Global Active Faults Database, Earthq. Spectra, 1–21, doi:10.1177/8755293020944182, 2020.
- Villamor, P., Barrell, D. J. A., Gorman, A., Davy, B., Hreinsdóttir, S., Hamling, I. J., Stirling, M. W., Cox, S. C., Litchfield, N. J., Holt, A., Todd, E., Denys, P., Pearson, C., C, S., Garcia-Mayordomo, J., Goded, T., Abbot, E., Ohneiser, C., Lepine, P. and F, C.-T.: Unknown faults under cities, Lower Hutt., 2018.
- Wedmore, L. N. J., Biggs, J., Williams, J. N., Fagereng, Dulanya, Z., Mphepo, F. and Mdala, H.: Active Fault Scarps in Southern Malawi and Their Implications for the Distribution of Strain in Incipient Continental Rifts, Tectonics, 39(3), e2019TC005834, doi:10.1029/2019TC005834, 2020.