

## Reply to Editor

Dear Authors

Thank you for revising your manuscript and for the detailed responses to the reviews. Although I support the inclusion of the discussion on the seismicity distribution as suggested in Review #2, the request for moving the description of the dataset to the supplementary material does not match the requirements of a data paper, unfortunately.

I suggest you double-check ESSD's submission guidelines (<https://www.earth-system-science-data.net/submission.html>).

In particular, to accept the MS for publication, I recommend restoring the original section "Data Availability" as Section 5 (before the conclusions, as per the guidelines), which must also specify the license associated with the dataset.

For the track-change version of the revised manuscript, please use the corresponding function in your text editor.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Best regards

Andrea Roviola

---

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the changes you have indicated to be made in the manuscript.

First of all, I have adapted the labelling of the supplementary material (as indicated by Katja Gänger) in agreement with the journal's guidelines, also updating and modifying the references within the manuscript accordingly.

Additionally, as you pointed out, I have restored the original "Data Availability" section, removing it from the supplement and placing it after the discussion section and before the conclusions (which I have renamed "Conclusive Remarks"). I have included the license under which the data is distributed (CC BY 4.0) both in the dedicated data section (now 5. Data Availability) and at the end of the "Code Availability" paragraph.

All changes in the manuscript, as well as in the supplements, are highlighted in yellow.

I hope I have addressed all the requests, and I remain available for any further clarifications.

Best regards,

Leonardo Colavitti, on behalf of the authors.