Final Revision on: “Enriching the GEOFON seismic catalogue with automatic energy magnitude estimations” by Dino Bindi, Riccardo Zaccarelli, Angelo Strollo, Domenico Di Giacomo, Andres Heinloo, Peter Evans, Fabrice Cotton, and Frederik Tilmann

The authors provided an explanation for each questions raised and added details and corrections to the manuscript that made some findings clearer, making it certainly suitable for publication. I would just like to ask the authors, if possible, to also include the two explanations (in blue) below in the manuscript before proceeding to publication. Thanks.

Eq. 2 allows to calculate Me from Mw, what is the error on Me?
The standard deviation of 0.246 for the between-event residuals (random effects) can be used to quantify the uncertainty of Me from equation 2. It is important to note that due to the simplicity of the linear model and the large population of data used for the regression (~750000 data points), the uncertainty of the median model defined by c1 and c2 is very low. When evaluating the uncertainty of the median model using:

$$\mathrm{var}\,[\bar{M}e]_{Mw} = J_o^T [\mathrm{varCov}]\, J_o \quad \text{(eq\_a)}$$

which includes the Jacobian matrix (J_o) and the variance-covariance matrix (varCov), the standard deviation of the variance of Me regression in (eq_a) for Mw=6 and 9 is 0.007 and 0.039, respectively.

The scaling of the obtained Me against SPUD Me(HF) seems to be close to 1:1. A simple statistical test (Student's t-test) could be useful to show if there is a significative difference from 1 of the slope for Me(HF) and also for M e(BB).
For MeHF, a Student’s t-test shows that the null-hypothesis that the slope is 1 cannot be rejected at 95% confidence (slope=1.0019, SE=0.0331, DF=363); for MeBB, the null hypothesis can be rejected (slope=0.8958, SE=0.0271, DF=363).