

Dear Reviewer 1,

Thank you very much for your thorough review and for your evaluation of our manuscript. We have followed your suggestions line by line and incorporated the corresponding modifications into the manuscript. We have slightly restructured Section 1 (Introduction) to further emphasise recent literature on the joint inversion of InSAR and GNSS data and added relevant papers on the topic (including Wu et al., 2024). We have also revised several figures in accordance with your comments. We believe that these changes have improved the quality and readability of the manuscript. We remain at your disposal in case any further changes or clarifications are required. Please, find below the detailed responses to each of your comments.

Overview and general recommendation

This paper provides an InSAR Kinematic Modelling based on a reliable and widely used approach (TDEFNODE). As reported by the authors, this model has been applied in the study zone but is limited to GPS/GNSS data. The relevant point is the joint inversion of GNSS and InSAR velocities. The authors present all the expected elements for a manuscript like this. After a detailed review of the manuscript, I consider the paper suitable for publication, but it will require minor corrections, as outlined in the following comments.

General comments:

The abstract, introduction, data and methodology, strain rate field, kinematic results, discussion, and conclusions are generally well written; however, minor comments are outlined in the next section as suggestions for the authors' consideration. In my view, probably, the inversion strategy is one of the most interesting contributions of this paper. However, I note a lack of revision of similar joint inversion strategies by other authors (e.g.). Wu et al. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2023GL106143>.

L. 34. It's correct NW-SE instead east to west?.

We changed it for "in a WNW-ESE direction", which we think is more accurate.

Figure 1. CHORT (in the caption)- is shown in the figure as CHOR. Motions instead of motion. I suggest using a different color bar for FM solutions. 1 arcsec instead of arc. sec.

We have standardised all CHORT references to CHOR. The other minor changes were also implemented in the caption. We changed the colour scale to make the change with depth more visible in the focal mechanisms. We also highlighted the FORE block following the suggestions from Reviewer 2.

L.57. Figure 1 shows 13 mm/yr.

Indeed, it varies from ~12 to ~14 mm/yr along El Salvador (increasing towards the west). We have added the 12-14 mm/yr reference.

L.63. Cocos and North American plates.

Done.

L.65 translated *into*.

Done.

L.81. based *on* GNSS

Done.

L. 82. Staller (2014) “created”. The use of this verb sounds rare.

You are right, we changed it for “developed”.

L.89. “without including” instead of excluding or maybe another sentence more gentle.

We changed it to “without including”.

L.96. Data and *methodology*.

Done.

L. 106. GNSS time series *accounting for*

Done.

Figure 2. “mm/yr” for BC figures.

We changed it in the B and C subpanels.

L. 130. Guatemala.

Done.

L.149. "mark" instead of represent

Done.

L.157. Our models are fed by

Done.

L 161. ($S=\Phi V$) italic?

Done.

L. 164. In the TDEFNODE, tectonic blocks are imagined as polygons limited by faults or free borders (McCaffrey, 2002; Meade et al., 2002).

We rephrased it and added the new reference: "In TDEFNODE, tectonic blocks are modelled as polygons bounded by faults or free boundaries (McCaffrey, 2002; Meade et al., 2002)."

L. 175. The crustal fault nodes,

Done.

L.180. In the text and figures, we found CHOR, CHORT. To review the uniformity in the whole manuscript.

Thank you for pointing this out. We have reviewed all references to the Chortís block throughout the manuscript and have standardised the terminology to "CHOR."

Figure 3. To revise the grammar of the sentence in the caption "The CSAL block, together with Af and Bf faults appear with an asterisk,--"

We have rephrased that sentence in the caption: “The CSAL block and the Af and Bf faults are marked with an asterisk, indicating that we also present models in which the CSAL block is tied to the FORE block and, consequently, these faults are not inverted.”

Please, let us know if it is still not clear enough.

L. 230 “ a predominance of NE-SW extension around the ESFZ, and ... , ~~which is consistent with Staller (2014).~~

Changed.

L.237. Table 1, and Supplement...

We added the comma.

Table 1. “Plus sign” instead of Positive.

Done.

L. 280. We generally obtain..

Done.

L. 281. Remain instead fo exist.

Done.

L. 283. We deem it

Done.

L. 295. Rewrite the sentence. “Causes the biggest difference” sounds uncommon.

We have rephrased that sentence: “However, introducing the CSAL block in central El Salvador produces the largest deviations from previous geodetic results in the main faults of the ESFZ, (...)”.

Please let us know if it still needs to be polished.

L. 308. North.

Done.

L. 315. They show, ~~thus,~~

Done.

L. 324. with high uncertainty

Done.

L. 326. ..dip nearly vertically.

Done.

L.328. We use ~~for our model~~ an average dip of 80° for faults within the ESFZ in our model.

Done.

L. 334. appears to be *predominantly* random in space,

Done.

L. 350. ...this single *accounts* for

Done.

L. 360. To revise the meaning of the sentence. Maybe: "...ESFZ decrease in strength..."

We opted for "decrease in magnitude". Let us know please if it sounds more natural now.

L. 363. In areas where ~~there is no~~ clearly dominant fault accumulates deformation, ...

We changed it to: "In areas without a clearly dominant fault accumulating deformation".

L. 374. To constrain its kinematics robustly.

Done.

Figure 6. (fault-parallel, fault-orthogonal)

Done.

L. 413. , the imposed creep

Changed (we understand that you were referring to “they imposed creep”).

L. 425. ...match the observed one better,

Done.

L. 435. Another ~~factor to consider~~ as a potential source

Done.

L. 443. ... than half are based on episodic

Done.

L. 448 ... and we do not have the resolution to resolve this issue using geodetic measurements.

Done.

L- 480. Additionally, we ~~also~~ test the

Done.

L. 495. Since deformation can accumulate ...

Done.

Figure 8. data, and the mean.

Done.