

Here are my comments on the paper.

First, it is really a very significant piece of work, and I think it is generally in very good shape.

I would think of submitting this to *Pure and Applied Geophysics*. They have a special issue on tsunamis coming up, and I am among the various co-editors of that issue. In general, these special issues are well run (I can say this having *NOT* been an Editor recently...) and relatively immune from problems with cantakerous reviewers, which are unfortunately too common these days. I am open to discussion, but I think this would have many advantages.

You will see that I have made a large number of corrections. They should not be taken as critical of the main scope of the paper, but rather as an effort to improve it, in the context of my more than 40 years of publishing in the field.

In very general terms, anything marked in red is a correction; anything marked or boxed in green is a comment.

- I have rearranged the order of the sections. Relocation efforts must come *before* magnitude and moment assessment. As a result, Figure numbers will have to be changed.

On many occasions, I have taken some of your text, and moved it elsewhere; for example, I think your call to sensitizing populations at risk to the duration of shaking, following the recommendation in the paper by Hill *et al.* should really constitute the final "bouquet", which should come after, not before the story of the *s'mong*.

- Only rarely did I suppress material; this is when I thought it was redundant, or that it brought very little added value. The paper is very long; this is not necessarily a critic, but we have to be diligent in this respect.
- I have considerably extended the discussion (on pages 30-36), by recasting the study along the theme "Why is it important, on a global scale, to have obtained new results about this event". This includes an enhanced discussion of where this event fits in the brotherhood of tsunami earthquakes, which is highlighted by a new Table. While this may depart from the initial scope of the paper, I think this section is very beneficial, and gives the paper a more global character.
- In very general terms, here are some areas where I identify concerns which need to be addressed:

- * The whole question of the time difference between Events I and II (green box making up Page 6a).

We need to find some consistency throughout the paper. I am not sure where you got the numbers on Page 6 (Line 113), but they are mutually inconsistent and they do not fit the observations at Manila. I personally would be in favor of sticking with the figure of 53 minutes, which is derived from the Manila seismogram (it can be measured with rulers as a difference in time on a single seismogram, as opposed to being obtained second-hand from Anonymous, 1909).

- * I am not exactly sure what happened with the far field tsunami data and simulation. You have a Figure 8 which shows a far-field simulation, but it is not described in the text. I think any reviewer will scream about this situation. I understand that the data in the far field may be only qualitative, but still I think we could make some comparison with 2007, for example. See how the diagram is remarkably similar to Model Number 3 on Figure 7 of my paper

www.earth.northwestern.edu/people/emile/PDF/EAO207.pdf

with the Northern part of Madagascar (where all the sites listed on Lines 383-388, Page 20 are located) masked by the Mauritius-to-Seychelles Mascarene Plateau. For example, putting virtual gauges in your simulation at the points where I had them in that paper (I also have an unpublished update with more points in Mozambique) at least trying to come close to a justification of the qualitative dataset in the far field; perhaps also producing a profile akin to Figure 8 of that paper.

- The correct unit for pressure is dynes *per* centimeters squared, not dynes multiplied by centimeters squared. This is properly abbreviated as dyn/cm^2 (where "dyn" is the proper abbreviation of "dynes"), not $\text{dyne} * \text{cm}^2$.
- A word about recurring stylistic comments;

This may sound like nitpicking, but in the long run, it becomes irritating.

- * I personally do not like the horrible notation $M 6$. A magnitude has a mathematical entity of its own. We define it with a *formula* containing an equal sign, e.g.,

$$M_s = \log_{10} \frac{A}{T} + 1.66 \log_{10} \Delta + 3.3$$

don't we? Then, I think $M = 6$ makes much more sense...

- * In general, units should be separated from their numbers: 13 km, not 13km.
- * In general, mathematical symbols such as +, -, \pm , \times , should be separated *left and right* from numbers:

$x + y, 4.8 \pm 0.23,$
rather than $x+y, 4.8\pm 0.23,$
and certainly not the asymmetric $x +y, 4.8 \pm 0.23$

The multiplicative symbol \times is sans-serifed, as opposed to the letter x.

- * In references, p. means a single page, pp. a range of pages.
p. 153 refers to Page 153 of a particular book, 153 pp., to a whole book, which has 153 pages.
 - * While I applaud your handling of Cyrillic (I myself have a couple of workstations where I can type in Russian), I doubt very much that any journal will accept it!
- **Please note that I do not have access to, and I believe never received, the Supplementary Material.**
- Finally, I have been doing all my typing for the past 40 years using troff (now groff). I do not use word, which is neither compatible with line commands, nor adapted to scientific writing, nor Tex, which is nothing short of a totally unfriendly monster.

I regret any inconvenience.