

Review of the revised manuscript “Modeling of terrain effect in magnetotelluric data from Garhwal Himalaya Region” by Suman Saini et. al., submitted to EGU sphere

General Comments:

The revised manuscript has been improved compared to the initial submission. Most of the issues I concerned in the first review have been corrected or addressed. However, the authors didn't reply the comments point by point, so I have to examine the responses of comments. The lines addressed in the responses letter were not consistent with the actual position in the manuscript.

In addition, the authors didn't reply several comments I gave in my first review, perhaps the authors believed the reviews were not suitable, even so they should classified or addressed the reasons in the responses letter. In my first review, 25 pieces of comments were given, however, the authors answered 16 points.

There are still some points needed to be corrected or modified before this manuscript can be accepted besides those comments not addressed in the first review

Specific Comments:

Line 12-14: “Magnetotelluric methods” should be written in singular format, and it is used to measure the electrical structure of the subsurface rather than surface.

Line 14-15: The sentence is written in a wrong style. It is a most effective geophysical technique.

Line 17: Do not use “In this paper” in the abstract, the abstract should be an entire presentation.

Line 22-24: The word “less” is misused. And this sentence is too long to understand, I recommend to use short sentence to represent the meanings.

Line 25: The abbreviation “TCR1” and “TCR2” should be used together with the full name when they are first mentioned, unless they are phrases known well.

Line 108: Where should be replaced with where.

Lines 107-116: The symbols used in the equations were not explained in detail.

Line 129: $10 \text{ k } \Omega \text{ m}$ should be replaced with $10000 \text{ } \Omega \text{ m}$.

Line 142: It will be better to add the results of Chouteau and Bouchard (1988) in Figure 2, so that the readers may understand the comparison in a very easy mean. Or the readers need to find the paper by Chouteau and Bouchard (1988) to compare the results. Additionally, the symbols in Figure 2 are too large to be seen clear.

Line 161: I still insist that the content of the section 4 is not compatible with the title. The content is the construction of the model, however, the modelling does not only consists of the model, the results should also be included in this section. I have addressed this point in my first review.