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Thanks to the reviewer’s fruitful comments. Due to the rejection, however, I would like to describe some points on the objections that may help change the decision.

- Regarding the Table 1 on correspondence between Dx and Magnitude ranges, I would like to point out that they are from the studies in the literature on earthquakes and the severity of anomalies.
- Regarding the space-time domain of analysis, I would like to point out that an extension to the study is underway for a period of 3 months and more, and more promising result have obtained. Studies on the radius of the areas affected by earthquake were carried out according to the Dobrovolsky formula. Periods of 15 or 16 days have also been selected based on other researchers' studies on each precursor.
- Regarding “Wrong EQ occurrence Predictions”, I would like to point out that any single precursor may give wrong prediction therefore multiple precursors with multiple predictions have been exploited and combined so that the uncertainties and false predictions are decreased and even avoided.
- Regarding MSE of the different precursors, it should be noted that V and M⁰ are obtained from the dates and intensities obtained from the precursors. Therefore, the difference in the type of precursors has no effect on this issue, because its input is not a physical quantity.
- Regarding minor points, all cases except for the one mentioned for line 57 were corrected. In the case of line 57, it should be noted that the first temperature is related to the ion and the second temperature is related to the electron.