

RESPONSE TO THE REVIEWER'S COMMENTS

REV#2 (Dr. Robin Kurtz)

Reply to comments

(row number and figure number refer to the revised version without tracked changes)

COMMENT 1: Figure 6, still I think that the 'restriction' model (2) correspond to the characteristic slip, and hence Schwartz and coppersmith 82 might be mentionned. I do insist on this because the characteristic slip model is a very strong assumption used in deterministic (and indirectly in probabilistic) seismic hazard assessments.

REPLY: We thank the Reviewer for the comment. We have modified the Figure 6 and added the reference in the text (Lines 200-201).

COMMENT 2: L325. It would be appropriate to mention the notion of surface rupture (instead of or in complement to 'faulting style') and related patterns, actually sustained by structural setting.

REPLY: We thank the Reviewer for the advice. Now we refer to “surface ruptures pattern” instead of faulting style (Line 327).

COMMENT 3: L326. Typo issue, majuscule.

REPLY: Ok, we have fixed it (Line 326).

COMMENT 4: Fig 10: thanks for considering the colors. I meant as well to color 'low' and 'intermediate with adapted colors (e.g. yellow and red), and also to correlate the color 'temperature' with the level of danger, i.e. interaction with fault. Hence following this logic 'High' might be red and 'low' green. Well this is just a suggestion for display.

REPLY: We thank the Reviewer for the suggestion. We have slightly modified the Figure 10 following the provided advice.

COMMENT 5: L378, typo (maybe consider reading carefully the typo of this section, that has been widely developped).

REPLY: We have slightly modified the sentence (Lines 379-381).