

EDITOR:

Please relabel the supplementary figures to Figure S1-S3 according to SE guidelines (<https://www.solid-earth.net/submission.html#assets> > Supplements).

The supplementary material and the references to it in the main manuscript have been adapted accordingly.

ADDITIONAL SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGES (following criticism on Twitter):

We received several critical comments on Twitter after posting the manuscript preprint. Unfortunately, these were not added to the public discussion on EGU'sphere, despite our attempt to stimulate such a discussion. Nevertheless, some of these comments appeared to us to point out important issues, that in part have also been raised by Reviewer #2.

Firstly, it was mentioned that the term “female” can be perceived as inappropriate when referring to women. Therefore, we attempted to use the word “women” in place of “female”. Wherever we refer to names (e.g., on the figures showing our results), we have kept the terms “female / male”, consistently with the genderizing tools, and for simplicity and conciseness.

Secondly, readers pointed out that automatic genderizing on a binary male-female name basis has attracted strong criticism in the past because it makes non-binary and other gender identities invisible and, more importantly, is not based on self-declared gender data (e.g. Strauss et al., 2020). We agree that studies of gender gaps in science should ideally be based on self-declared data, such as those collected by the EGU. We have added corresponding comments in the conclusions. However, such data are currently hardly available or not available at all.

In the manuscript, we have attempted to clarify that we do not use the term “gender” to refer to how people see themselves, but to how they are perceived through their names (lines 363 - 366). We believe that our study is important, because it provides a current approximate view of gender imbalance in seismology authorship and can motivate improvements in data collection in the future.