

Answers of authors of manuscript npg-2018-57, to reviewers.

We again express gratitude to both reviewers who noted about necessity of language correction of our manuscript.

Present version of our manuscript has been professionally proofread by Proof-Reading-Service.com Ltd, Devonshire, UK.

As for suggestions of E. Papadimitriou:

-The Map in Fig. 1 has already been changed during first revision. In present version we decide not to change map because in this case part of EQs in considered catalogue will not be shown in the map (Fig.1).

-Also during first revision we explained why we prefer to use seismic energy but not moment in this work. Moreover, we do not see reason to show seismic moment in Figure 5 while through the entire manuscript we speak about seismic energy.

Other suggestions were gratefully accepted and figures 5 and 6 are now corrected.

We also note that we added footnote in page 16 and one sentence in the summary where we say that recent strong earthquakes in California we consider as confirmation of pointed in the manuscript idea, that after long series of randomlike windows may follow window with strong earthquakes.