

Response letter

Dear Editor,

We thank the reviewer for pointing out errors in the manuscript. We have taken the comments into account and have amended the manuscript as outlined below.

Q- Page 1: acronyms 3D, 2D and PBE are not defined.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Abstract, line 6: delete “a”.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Abstract, line 7: it should read “show” and not “shows”.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Introduction, line 4: what does “Few and multiple” mean?

R- Was corrected (multi-layer not multiple).

Q- Introduction, line 9: it should be “has” and not “have”.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Page 1, fourth last line of the Introduction: it should be “that” and not “who”.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Figure 1: Indicate clearly which atoms are Pt and which are Se/Te.

R- Was corrected (The grey and yellow balls represent the Pt and Se/Te atoms, respectively.).

Q- Computational details section, line 5: the authors should explain why they chose 520 eV for bulk and 350 eV and bi- and mono-layers as cut off energies.

R- Was corrected (by using convergence test).

Q- Figures 2-5: units on both x- and y-axes should be added.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Table 3: why is “semi-metals” plural and not singular?

R- Was corrected.

Q- Table 2: add “nu” in the caption. Also, there is no proper explanation in the text about the actual meaning of the C_{1j} constants.

R- Was corrected (C_{ij} (i and j are tensor coordinates)).

Q- Page 3, lines 3 and 4: it should be “describe” and not “describes”.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Page 3, line 7: “depended” does not read correctly in this context.

R- Was corrected.

Q- Page 3, line 9: add a reference for the Hill’s approach.

R- Was corrected (added).