

Review of the revised manuscript entitled: "**Negentropy anomaly analysis of the borehole strain associated with the Ms 8.0 Wenchuan earthquake**" by Zhu et al.

The authors have done a good job in responding the comments and modifying the manuscript. By adding Sec.5 where they compare their findings for further sensors and other periods (non disturbed by large shocks), they provide further evidence to strengthen the unusual character of their observations. They also ruled out a possible influence of environmental factors on the strain signals during the 2008 Wenchuan earthquake. I agree with their conclusion which stated that although the negentropy method and its results are interesting (and intriguing), linking the observed changes to the nucleation process still requires further data and analyses. I therefore recommend publication in NPG journal.

One point can still be improved concerning the description of the data (Sec. 2) and particularly how the authors derive the 'residual high frequency signals' (in Fig. 3). The authors explained clearly their approach in the response letter to reviewer 2 (as steps 1 & 2, pp. 9-10), also it would be interesting if they can also detailed the protocol (basically steps 1 & 2) in the manuscript.

Minor comments :

- Abstract (L. 2) : you can say that you analyze negentropy for 3 strainmeters (not only GUZA) ?

- Abstract (L. 7) : 'Combined with the confusion discussion ...' : what you refer here is not clear, maybe just provide major results of this section in the Abstract ?

- Introduction (L. 10) : 'at least some large' → at least **for** some large.

- Introduction (L. 13) : Hsu et al. (2015) paper does not analyze earthquake strain signals (only meteorological perturbations), there may be a confusion here ?

- Introduction (L. 50) : the authors may consider changing the name of the 'Confusion Discussion' (Sec. 5), that sounds awkward when reading the main text.

- Fig. 1 (legend) : please consider adding details (e.g., the blue rectangles show the strainmeter stations, the epicenter is shown by yellow star + add the timing of the mainshock, 12 May 2008).

- L. 184-185 : 'Thus, we consider the Wenchuan earthquake day may be a critical time during the whole Wenchuan earthquake process' → that sentence is weird and has no clear purpose, you may consider remove it.

L. 196-199 : these sentences are confusing, please consider rewrite them.

L. 218-219 : 'However, since the curve is approximately, ... the value of inflection point exists a range.' → which range ? Something is missing in this sentence.

L. 219 : may **be** able.

L. 219 and 224 : 'receive' → rather 'detect' or 'record'.

L. 243 : 'Through the confusion discussion' → modify by 'In Sec. 5' for exemple.