

SC1: 'About a false fact', Mitsuki Yadate, 17 Jul 2020

1. Eksi Sözlük actually is a "collaborative hypertext dictionary" (a.k.a. "interactive dictionary" or "participatory dictionary" among Turkish people). - I agree with you for the description of the eksisozluk. In fact, I describe it as "collaborative dictionary" in line 23. I will make the proper correction for its description in line 2 in which I describe it as "forum-like".

RC1: 'review', Anonymous Referee #1, 24 Aug 2020

1. The authors analyze the user entries for some earthquakes occurred in Turkey area; the related intensities are estimated and the results between the user entries and the shakemaps are compared. The results are very interesting and the conclusions address an issue of importance to microseismic intensities and shaking estimations; the paper is well written and structured and the topic well fits the aims and scope of the journal. For these reasons I recommend the publication - We are thankful to the anonymous reviewer for the encouraging comments. We are also glad to hear an acceptance of our study from the anonymous referee.

RC2: 'Reviewer's comments', Anonymous Referee #2, 30 Oct 2020

1. The manuscripts uses a lot of unnecessary abbreviations - There is only one abbreviation that is used once. We delete these abbreviations in line 69.
2. The description of the methodology is rather thin, the reader should expect a more detailed explanation what is exactly done. - We expand the Method section.
3. In the discussion the authors correctly point out that because of users' the location is known only at the district level, and taking the centroid location of the district introduces errors due to the variability of soil conditions within the district. Moreover, changes in population density are only rudimentarily taken into account. - This is correct. Even if we implement the population density on top of the data that we collected, we do not have the neighborhood level information of these data.
4. The manuscript makes an interesting observation: people who felt larger number of earthquakes, make better a guess about the magnitude of the earthquake than those who live in an aseismic region, although I'm not sure how does this helps in the determination of magnitude. - We compare the magnitude estimations of users that are living regions where earthquakes with various magnitudes are more common with users that are living regions where earthquakes are relatively rare. Our proposal on the user estimation relies on the fact that users experienced seismic activities more often have a baseline to compare their latest feeling with their previous experiences. On the other hand, users lives in less seismically active regions have lack of such baseline. Hence they may think that they felt the earthquake due to its larger magnitude. We explain this on lines between 205 and 209.
5. The authors observe that the residuals between observed and predicted MCS values increase with distance, but do not give any explanation why. - We believe that it is due to the fact of lack of explanation of users' experience. We express our thoughts in lines between 180 and 181.
6. The future work section is a wish list for possible tasks for the public website, and therefore it is quite irrelevant for the paper itself. I recommend deleting it. - We believe that in the case of a collaboration with the website, it'd be a nice data provider. Hence, we'd like to point out the significance of possible collaboration.
7. The only difference between the intensity maps and felt reports is that the locations of the felt reports are plotted on top of the intensity maps; there is no need for two separate figures. - We keep the figures with EMS information and delete the other type of presentation.