Manuscript Number: GMJ 231005

Title: Seshadri Constants of Curve Configurations on Surfaces
Authors: Krishna Hanumanthu, Praveen Roy and Aditya Subramaniam

We thank the referee for carefully reading the manuscript and suggesting many useful changes and also for pointing out an error in the Assumption 2.1 which leads to ambiguities at several places. We fixed this error by assuming that the arrangement is connected.

We also agree with the referee that Example 2.21 can be shortened and it is better to focus on the computation of Seshadri constants.

Below we describe in detail the changes made to the manuscript based on the referee's comments.

- Following the referee's suggestion, we included the assumption that the arrangement $\mathcal{C}$ is *connected*. We added a remark immediately after Assumption 2.1 mentioning that the connectedness assumption implies that $C_i \cdot C_j > 0$ for all i, j.
- We also removed the unnecessary assumption that all the curves do not meet at any point. Referee correctly noted that this is not necessary for the main results.

  We only needed this assumption while computing the configurational Seshadri constants in Section 2.3. We therefore added the required assumption at the beginning of Section 2.3.
- We retained the condition that all curves in our arrangements are linearly equivalent to a specific divisor. Many of the results and questions we state depend on this assumption. So removing this assumption will require a substantial re-working of the paper.
- We have revised Example 2.21 considerably. We shortened it to focus solely on the computation of the Seshadri constant.