We would like to express our sincere appreciation of the reviewers' comments regarding our manuscript. The reviewer's specific comments are addressed as follows**:**

Comment 1: In the past and recent years, low-Earth orbit (LEO) satellites and in particularly Swarm mission has offered interesting results related to earthquake studies that are worth-mentioned in Introduction and/or Discussion and Conclusions. Indicatively:

Balasis, G., and M. Mandea (2007), Can electromagnetic disturbances related to the recent great earthquakes be detected by satellite magnetometers?, Tectonophysics, 431, doi:10.1016/j.tecto.2006.05.038.

De Santis, A., et al. Geospace perturbations induced by the Earth: The state of the art and future trends. J. Phys. Chem. Earth, 85–86 (2015), 17–33, doi:10.1016/j.pce.2015.05.004.

De Santis, A., G. Balasis, F.J. Pavón-Carrasco, G. Cianchini, and M. Mandea (2017), Potential earthquake precursory pattern from space: The 2015 Nepal event as seen by magnetic Swarm satellites, Earth and Planetary Science Letters, 461, 119-126, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2016.12.037.

De Santis, A., Marchetti, D., Pavón-Carrasco, F.J. et al. Precursory worldwide signatures of earthquake occurrences on Swarm satellite data. Sci Rep 9, 20287 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-56599-1.

Sasmal, S.; Chowdhury, S.; Kundu, S.; Politis, D.Z.; Potirakis, S.M.; Balasis, G.; Hayakawa, M.; Chakrabarti, S.K. Pre-Seismic Irregularities during the 2020 Samos (Greece) Earthquake (M = 6.9) as Investigated from Multi-Parameter Approach by Ground and Space-Based Techniques. Atmosphere 2021, 12, 1059. https://doi.org/10.3390/atmos12081059.

Reply (Pulinets&Hegai): Thank you for your proposal. We inserted these references in the list with some short comments in Introduction

Comment 2: "Line 519: 'Results Discussion' → 'Discussion of the results'
Additionally, the authors could consider to have a single section "Discussion and Conclusions" instead of 2 separate sections."

Reply(Pulinets&Hegai): We follow the Respected Referee recommendation and transformed the text producing the common paragraph Discussion and conclusion

Comment 3: "However, here I have to make a major comment: Section 4 only offers a summary of the results for the 2 EQs presented in Sections 2 and 3. There is no comparison of the derived results with other studies of EQ precursors related to the lithosphere-atmosphere-ionosphere

system. The authors should offer to the reader a perspective and importance of their results in the context of the topic under investigation."

Reply (Pulinets&Hegai): We introduced the additional text connected both with the precious researches in LAIC domain and the perspectives for results presented in the paper.

Comment 4:"Section 5 A verb is missing from the 1st point, e.g. "… **we provide estimates of the maximum value of** …"
Reply: Corrected

Comment 5 : I am also a bit puzzled with the 3rd point that simply reads as a catalogue of parameters related to the electrical conductivity at various altitudes. Please consider rewording of this point.

Reply: Corrected

Comment 6: Reference style: references in MDPI journals, including *Atmosphere*, are usually provided as numbers in brackets in the main text of an article.
Reply: Corrected

Comment 7: Edits:
Lines 20-21: do you mean '8-9' and '1-2' here? Line
73: 'anomies' ⟶ 'anomalies'
Line 84: 'what' ⟶ 'that'
Line 92: '/ultra-low-frequency (ELF)' ⟶ '/extremely-low-frequency (ELF)' Line
99: please indicate here the depth of this EQ.
Lines 124-125: please indicate also here the depth of the second EQ. Line
139: please define what 'λ' and 'φ' stand for.
Line 141: please correct according to: 'F10.7 ~ 81 SFU' and also define the meaning of 'SFU'.
Line 148: the verb is missing from this sentence (e.g. 'show'). Line 150:
do you mean '12-13 UT (1-2 h LT)' here?
Line 330: please define the term 'VLF'. Line
558: 'forminf' ⟶ 'form'.
Reply: Corrected

Comment 8: There is a general problem of the manuscript as I am not sure what is the meaning of the symbol '÷' and I would suggest to replace it throughout the MS.

Reply(Hegai): (÷) – The **obelus (**Unicode U+00F7) used in engineering to denote a range of values (similar to the en-dash), in order not to be confused with division sign (colon). Authors have used this symbol to indicate a range between physical quantities to distinguish between hyphens/dashes commonly used to indicate spacing between links and pages (e.g. [1-3] and P. 1-5).