Dear Editor,

We thank the referee for their constructive comments on our manuscripts. We have made changes according to the comments, hopefully now the manuscript is acceptable for publication in SAIP proceedings. Following are some important changes that we have made following the referee comments.

Sincerely,

R. Moharana and S. Razzaque

---

*Referee 1 and 2- Numerical grammatical issues*

Our reply: We have now corrected those issues.

*Referee1- Is the three times \delta \gamma equivalent to 3 standard deviations?
What are the errors on the Swift GRB positions?*

Our Reply – The angular resolution reported by IceCube is the Median of the distribution so it is not the 3\sigma value of the error.

The positional error with swift is within arcmin, however we have not taken into account this error in our correlation analysis considering these are too small compared to the angular resolution of the neutrino events.

Referee 2-

*"For our analysis we have considered only the track events that have better angular resolution,
which directly trace to the sources."What do the authors mean by "better angular resolution"? Please explain what restriction is applied.And what is meant by "directly trace to the sources."? Are the authors implying the correlation is perfect between the source and the neutrino, therefore the neutrino originates unequivocally from the GRB? This seems unlikely given the average ~1deg error mentioned in the introduction. Please clarify this statement.*

Our Reply – We have now rewritten the line. The track events are due to muon scattering in the detector compared to shower event where the event is due to hadronic channels. Thereby track events have more accuracy in point source search compared to showers.

*"In our analysis we have also included the ANTARES event having energy between
50 TeV to 100 TeV [10]."Reference [10] is the ANTARES detection ATel, but doesn't appear to give the energy of the neutrino that is included in this paper. The reference to the energy range should be included.*

Our Reply – We have cited a new reference for the energy of the ANTARES event. As the exact numbers are not mentioned any where, we have considered the lowest energy that is 50 TeV for our calculation.

*"For GRBs, we have used the Swift detected GRBs from 2004 to 2014 using Swift GRB table
from NASA site [11]."Reference [11] is the url is to the archive site, while the query for the GRB table is at*[*https://swift.gsfc.nasa.gov/archive/grb\_table/*](https://swift.gsfc.nasa.gov/archive/grb_table/) *If any restriction were applied in the selection of the GRBs this should be stated in the paper.In addition, since this is just a url, I would recommend giving it as a footnote, like is done for the previous Swirft url.*

Our Reply – We have corrected the text according to the suggestions.

*Could the authors please explain (very briefly) their choice of n =1 or 2.*

Our Reply – The “n”-th term in the expansion of the dispersion relation in Eq.2. Usually it is taken for lower numbers like 1 or 2.

*page 3, section around equation 4: The description of how the pseudo-redshift is calculate is unclear. In equation (4), I assume the redshift is calculated from the luminosity distance D\_L in the equation. But D\_L is not defined. Also, looking at reference [14], it is not immediately obvious where this equation comes from. I recommend this section is slightly expanded to make the determination of the pseudo-redshift clearer.*

Our Reply – We have now cited the paper that has the exact expression. The pseudo-redshift is calculated using the popular Amati relation, the correlation of the peak energy and isotropic energy. We have used the available peak energy and fluence in the relation to calculate the luminosity distance.

 *References:The formatting of references is mixed up. Some are year,journal,volume; others are journal,year,volume. Sometimes the journal name is in italic, sometimes not. And in [12] "The Astrophysical Journal" (which is normally abbreviated as ApJ) is written out, but in the next reference [13] is abbreviated at APJ.*

Our Reply – The references are now in the SAIP publication format.