

Revision for Editor

In the table below, our response (in blue text) can be found beneath each of your specific comments (in black text) which we have numbered for ease of any further discussion. We also provide the track changes version of the article.

	General comments
1	Add commas after et al. in citations throughout the paper when followed by the year. Done
2	Reduce the use of parenthetical and dashed phrases within sentences. I've highlighted cases where these are distracting and can be reworded or the () or -- substituted with commas. Done
3	In lists, use and or or after the last comma. Done
4	Take out unnecessary words or phrases to shorten sentences and improve readability Done
5	Eliminate or replace ambiguous language Done
6	Make and back up all points clearly in the text so that the tables serve as a supplement but are not required to understand your arguments while reading the body of the paper Done
7	Clarify when you are talking about only respondents from the conferences vs. the outreach events Done
8	Cf. refers to 'compare to'--I think what you mean here is 'see for example'; please change all instances to 'see for example' or 'e.g.,'. Done
9	Use punctuation consistently in table, i.e., add periods to the end of all sentences Done
	Specific comments

10	<p>1 “risk of seismicity” itself is ambiguous. Does this mean potential for damage or casualties? Or is it, like the other language you address in the article, left ambiguous by stakeholders and researchers?</p> <p>Good point. We have replaced with “The potential to induce seismicity”.</p>
11	<p>13 Add in what year “halted shale gas operations and triggered moratoria.” If more than one year and specificity is difficult, change “halted” to “has halted”.</p> <p>Changed to ‘has halted’ as you suggest.</p>
12	<p>13-16 Please clarify: is the disconnect between the level of risk vs. concern about that risk, or between levels of risk perceived by publics vs. expert groups? Do you mean to have the word “concern” in this sentence? This could read that there is a disconnect between the level of concern *perceived* by publics and reported (about whom?) by expert groups. This sentence would benefit from removing unnecessary words, using more precise language if possible, and potentially breaking it up into two or more sentences.</p> <p>We agree, this could be worded more clearly. At this point, we don’t know if the disconnect is due to differences in the perceived risk, or the acceptability of that risk (concern). Taking on board your suggestions, we have replaced with:</p> <p>“Prior to 2018 there seemed to be a disconnect between the conclusions of expert groups about the risk of adverse impacts from hydraulic fracturing induced seismicity, and the reported level of public concern about hydraulic fracturing induced seismicity. Further, a range of terminology was used to describe the induced seismicity (including tremors, earthquakes, seismic events, and micro-earthquakes) which could indicate the level of perceived risk.”</p>
13	<p>17-18 Please be more specific. Conclusions about what? Whether there is a risk of seismicity due to hydraulic fracturing?</p> <p>We see your point. The text now reads “Using the UK as a case study, we examine the conclusions of expert-led public-facing reports on the risk (likelihood and impact) of seismicity induced by hydraulic fracturing for shale gas published between 2012 and 2018 and the terminology used in these reports”</p>
14	<p>22 Add colon : after years</p> <p>Colon added</p>
15	<p>23-26 This is possibly the most important finding of your research, so please state it more explicitly, e.g., that what appeared to be polarization in their views was actually the result of different interpretations of the language used. “By examining the rationale provided for their answers we find that what appeared to be polarisation of views amongst experts was actually the result of different interpretations of the language used to describe seismicity.” Responses are confounded by ambiguity of language around earthquake risk, magnitude, and scale.</p> <p>Agree. Rephrased to: “By examining the rationale provided for their answers we find that an apparent polarisation of views amongst experts was actually the result of different interpretations of the language used to describe seismicity. Responses are confounded by ambiguity of language around earthquake risk, magnitude, and scale. We find that different terms are used in the survey responses to describe</p>

	earthquakes, often in an attempt to express the risk (magnitude, shaking, potential for adverse impact) presented by the earthquake, but that these terms are poorly defined and ambiguous and do not translate into everyday language usage.”
	Highlights
16	Green highlights indicate grammar/punctuation/spelling/redundancy issues. I am in the U.S.; it is possible that I have highlighted something that is standard for UK English, in which case, please ignore. Thank you. All of these have been resolved.
17	Salmon highlights indicate a need for rewording or changes in punctuation due to ambiguity, confusing language, unnecessary language, or unnecessary parentheses or dashes. Thank you. All of these have been resolved. We note the irony of using confusing language to present a paper about confusing language.
18	Yellow highlights indicate clarification needed. Thank you. We provide clarification to all instances.