6 Feb. 2015

Hi Ken,

better late than never, I hope. I read through the paper. I used track changes and added quite a few comments, where I was puzzled or thought the paper needed more clarification. Please see the comments. I made LOTS of English corrections and suggestions.

I'm not sure that figures 6-10 contribure a lot of new information. Having figure 6 followed by what is now 10, with some discussion of the improvement would be good enough. I'd rather see some more cross sections (with the trends of the cross sections indicated on the map, A-A', B-B', etc), so that perhaps one could better see any faults, etc. At the very least, a N-S cross section and one parallel and perpendicular to the Polaris/other NE/SW trending faults would be interesting. This would probably also be the place to give more detail about the 3d imaging that you don't show.
Another thing that might help contribute to distinguishing the faults is to have each cluster of seismicity show up in a different color on the cross section (and corresponding on the map, of course).

Also on the maps it would be useful to have Truckee and Reno marked (T, R), because I'm not as familiar with the area and have to guess which basin hosts Truckee and Reno. It might also help to have a faint outline of the lake on the maps.

The use of "high-angle", "dextral" and "sinistral" in place of the more common "steeply dipping", "right lateral" and "left lateral" was somewhat irritating. If that is what the former three mean. If not, there needs to be more clarification.

It would be nice if you specifically reference the BDSN data if you used it (see http://ncedc.org/acknowledge.html). And most of the MTs are probably Berkeley MTs.

I think most of the other comments ended up in the document.

Please let me know if you have any questions, and forgive me for the delay in my review.

Best regards,
Peggy Hellweg